

# THE MONTH

*A Catholic Magazine and Review.*

FEBRUARY, 1893.

## CONTENTS.

1. THE LICENSING SYSTEM AND THE MANCHESTER CONFERENCE. <i>By the Rev. James Halpin</i>	153
2. ON THE CONDITION OF UNBAPTIZED CHILDREN AFTER DEATH. <i>By the Editor</i>	160
3. ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY, 1572. <i>By the Rev. William Loughnan</i>	175
4. THE ZAMBESI MISSION. Father Kerr's Journey to Fort Salisbury	196
5. THE DIVINE OFFICE IN THE GREEK CHURCH. The Constituent Parts of the Akolouthia. <i>By the Rev. B. Zimmerman, O.C.D.</i>	213
6. HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY. <i>By the Rev. William Humphrey</i>	229
7. A MIXED MARRIAGE. The Third Phase. <i>By the Lady Amabel Kerr</i>	256
Chap. I.—The Great Calm.	
" II.—In the Presence of Death.	
" III.—Arnold.	
REVIEWS	271
1. The Life of Jesus Christ according to the Gospel History. <i>By the Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i> 2. Bellesheim's Irish Church History. 3. St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity. <i>By the Abbé Fouard.</i> 4. The Lothian Essay, 1892—The Jesuits in Poland. <i>By A. F. Pollard, B.A.</i> 5. La France Révolutionnaire 1789—1889. <i>Par Charles d'Héricault.</i> 6. Tatian's Diatessaron. <i>By Michael Maher, S.J.</i> 7. Sound and Music. <i>By the Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C.</i> 8. Simon Magus. <i>By G. R. S. Mead, B.A.</i> 9. The Sacrament of Penance. 10. Secret Service under Pitt. <i>By W. T. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A.</i> 11. Hierurgia. <i>By David Rock, D.D.</i> 12. A Mother's Sacrifice, and other Tales. <i>By A. M. Clarke.</i>	
LITERARY RECORD	296
I.—Books and Pamphlets.	
II.—Magazines.	

LONDON :

OFFICE OF THE MONTH: MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES. DUBLIN: M. H. GILL AND SON.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND CO.

Price Two Shillings.

*All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.*

**THE GREAT  
BLOOD  
PURIFIER  
AND  
RESTORER.**

**"FOR THE BLOOD IS THE LIFE?"**

**CLARKE'S  
WORLD-FAMED**

**BLOOD MIXTURE**

**LARGEST SALE  
OF ANY  
MEDICINE  
IN  
THE WORLD.**

The Great Blood Purifier and Restorer. For Cleansing and Clearing the Blood from all impurities, it cannot be too highly recommended.

For Scrofula, Scurvy, Eczema, Skin and Blood Diseases, Pimples and Sores of all kinds, it is a never-failing and permanent cure.

It Cures Old Sores.  
Cures Sores on the Neck.  
Cures Sore Legs.  
Cures Pimples on the Face.  
Cures Scurvy.  
Cures Eczema.

It Cures Ulcers.  
Cures Blood and Skin Diseases.  
Cures Glandular Swellings.  
Clears the Blood from all impure matter,  
From whatever cause arising.

It is the only real specific for Gout and Rheumatic Pains. It removes the cause from the blood and bones.

As this mixture is pleasant to the taste, and warranted free from anything injurious to the most delicate constitution of either sex, from infancy to old age, the Proprietors solicit sufferers to give it a trial to test its value.

**Important Advice to all.**—Cleanse the vitiated blood whenever you find its impurities bursting through the skin in pimples, eruptions, and sores; cleanse it when you find it obstructed and sluggish in the veins; cleanse it when it is foul—your feelings will tell you when. Keep your blood pure, and the health of the system will follow.

Sold in Bottles 2s. 9d. each, and in cases containing Six times the quantity, 11s., sufficient to effect a permanent cure in the great majority of long-standing cases. BY ALL CHEMISTS AND PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS throughout the world, or sent to any address on receipt of 33 or 132 stamps by the Proprietors, THE LINCOLN & MIDLAND COUNTIES' DRUG COMPANY, LINCOLN.

**TRADE MARK, "BLOOD MIXTURE."**

Ask for CLARKE'S World-Famed BLOOD MIXTURE, and do not be persuaded to take an imitation.

**THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!**

**HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT**

These excellent FAMILY MEDICINES are invaluable in the treatment of all ailments incidental to every HOUSEHOLD. The PILLS PURIFY, REGULATE, and STRENGTHEN the whole system, while the OINTMENT is unequalled for the cure of Bad Legs, Bad Breasts, Old Wounds, Sores and Ulcers. Possessed of these REMEDIES, every Mother has at once the means of curing most complaints to which herself or Family is liable.

*N.B.*—Advice Gratis at 78, New Oxford Street, late 533, Oxford Street, London, daily between the hours of 11 and 4, or by letter.

**ZAEHNSDORF,  
BOOKBINDER,**

**Cambridge Works, 144 & 146, Shaftesbury Avenue, W.C.**

(FOR FIFTY YEARS AT CATHERINE STREET, STRAND.)

**Artistic Bindings to any Design.**

BOOKS BOUND IN VELVET, SILK, OR WORKED MATERIAL.

**Library Bindings in Cloth, Half Calf, or Half Morocco.**

SPECIAL ATTENTION GIVEN TO BOOKS WITH PLATES.

**MISSALS AND ALTAR BOOKS STRONGLY BOUND.**

Medals. — DUBLIN, 1865.

PARIS, 1867.

VIENNA, 1873.

**VANHEEMS AND WHEELER,**  
*Exclusively Clerical Tailors.*

The only House in England which is conversant with the Roman formula in respect to the canonical dress of the Catholic Hierarchy.

**47, Berners Street, London, W.**







## *The Licensing System and the Manchester Conference.*

---

SOME account has already been given in THE MONTH of what is popularly known as "the Gothenburg licensing system," and also of the system of Local Option. In favour of each there is much to be said ; and many think that nothing less drastic, can supply an adequate remedy for the evils of our drink system as we find them. It is idle, however, to ignore the fact, that there are, on the other hand, many, and amongst those most interested in the social and religious welfare of the people, who are not prepared to go the length of either, and who believe that safer and simpler expedients may be found and ought to be adopted. To their thinking those systems are unlikely ever to commend themselves to the majority of the people in these countries, and would be unworkable even if adopted : they are unsuited to our circumstances, and out of harmony with our prejudices, and it is therefore the duty and interest of all who are concerned about Temperance reform to turn aside from ideals, and to labour in unison for the best that is within our reach. That is to say, that we should all, those who may be designated extreme and those who are more moderate, agree on some practical and substantial measure of licensing reform ; and thus endeavour to reduce within the smallest possible compass, evils the existence and the magnitude of which all alike acknowledge and deplore. To the United Kingdom Alliance and kindred associations, they would say : We do not call on you to abandon the object for which you have been striving for years ; work on ; and in the future, as in the past, much good may result, if only in the education of the people on a subject which concerns them so intimately : but we need some remedy for a pressing evil, and we need it *now* ; come and help us to secure it. "Those various parties," wrote Cardinal Vaughan, then Bishop of Salford, "have done good service by educating the public to believe, that some

legislative remedy is necessary. But may not the general public now fairly turn to those parties who in their zeal have alternately hindered each other's effort at legislation during the last twenty years, and bid them for the moment lay aside their preferences and find some common platform of agreement? They may agree on no heroic or extreme measure: but the public is sick, and calls upon the doctors to consult together, and quickly apply the best remedy they can instead of waiting till half of us are dead."

It is a view that deserves attention if for no other reason, than the number and character of those who advocate it: and it will therefore be worth while to notice one or two of the practical proposals that have been recently suggested.

With the proposed Bill of the Bishop of Chester I do not mean to deal at length, though it is the latest that has been before the public. That Bill would be in substance the Gothenburg system: or an attempt to modify the same so as to better suit the circumstances of these countries. The criticism, whether favourable or adverse, therefore, of the prototype, may be applied more or less to the scheme of his Lordship of Chester. It attracted a large amount of public notice, and its reception by the press, and otherwise, was on the whole favourable. The evils which the Bishop sought to remedy were so widespread and palpable, that people welcomed any well-meant attempt at reform; while the results which he prophesied so hopefully, were of such a kind as would reasonably secure the large support that was accorded him. To largely reduce the number of licensed houses, to eliminate altogether the bars and lower class of public-house,—to practically change the remaining into what may be more properly called "eating houses" or restaurants than public-houses, to supply food and healthy amusements as well as drink, and finally to encourage managers of the licensed establishments, to push the sale of food and non-intoxicants rather than of intoxicating drink—these may be said to be the results the Bishop looked for and promised: and it is no wonder that a "public that was sick" welcomed his proposals with joy. That the scheme, or indeed any modification of the Gothenburg system would be preferable to our actual licensing system, is beyond question: whether it is the best and most suitable, is a matter about which there will be much difference of opinion. To take one critic, more or less hostile, the Bishop of Manchester does not quite agree with his brother of Chester.

He is not prepared to hand over the management of public-houses to the public bodies suggested: nor does he think the British taxpayer is ready to advance the amount required for equitable compensation, and to set up the new establishments contemplated, and finally he believes that a simpler and a sounder system may be found in the proposals of the Licensing Conference that was held at Manchester some time ago. It is to these proposals chiefly I desire to call attention.

About two years ago, a committee was formed in Manchester of persons interested in the Temperance cause, and who were desirous to determine and agree upon, some practical and substantial measure of licensing reform. The two Bishops—the Bishop of Salford and the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, took a leading part in its deliberations. For many reasons the proposals of the Conference deserve our attention, and more of it than they have thus far secured. They may be taken as representing what the more moderate reformers demand: they are set before us in practical shape, for they have been embodied in a Bill: they deal with such vexed questions as compensation and licensing bodies, and we may safely conclude that something on their lines may be hoped for in the near future. The following are among the chief features of the proposals. The Councils, town and county, are constituted the licensing authorities: and they are to appoint, out of their own body, a licensing committee: in lieu of compensation, actual licenses would run for a period of seven years; any new licenses that may be granted would be put up for sale by auction; and they would be granted only in a certain proportion, relatively to the population. At a preliminary meeting the following were proposed as the bases of discussion: and they will indicate also the nature of the leading provisions of the suggested Bill.

1. That it is desirable that the licensing authority be elected by the ratepayers.
2. That the County Councils be constituted the licensing authority for the respective districts.
3. That each County Council shall divide the area over which it has jurisdiction into convenient licensing districts.
4. That all licenses shall determine at the end of seven years from the passing of the proposed Bill.
5. That a convenient period before the expiration of the above-named seven years the licensing authority may grant licenses in each district for the sale of intoxicating liquors on and off the premises to

come into force at the expiration of the licenses now existing, and at the following rate, viz:—In boroughs: One license if the population be under 1,500, two licenses if the population be over 1,500 and under 3,000, three licenses if the population be over 3,000 and under 4,000, and one additional license for every additional 1,000 of the population. In districts not boroughs: One license if the population be under 900, two licenses if the population be over 900 and under 1200, three licenses if the population be over 1,200 and under 1,800, and one additional license for every additional 600 of the population. Provided, however, that if the ratepayers of any given district decide by a three-fourths majority that no license shall be issued for the sale of intoxicating liquor in such district none shall be issued.

6. But additional licenses (annual) may be issued upon payment for the sale of intoxicating liquors at *bona fide* hotels established for the provision of sleeping and boarding accommodation for travellers, and also to *bona fide* eating-houses.

7. The new licenses shall remain in force for one or more years.

8. That the ratepayers of any given district shall have power to decide by a three-fourths majority that no house licensed for the sale of drink shall be open on Sundays in their district, or that the hours of sale on Sundays may be reduced, or that the licensed houses shall be closed at ten o'clock on week-days. But such vote of the ratepayers shall be taken at a convenient time before the issue of the licenses.

9. All clubs where intoxicating liquors are sold shall be subject to the inspection and control of the licensing authority.

10. That this proposed scheme of licensing reform shall apply to England only.

It will be observed that the proposals are very similar to the provisions of Mr. Bruce's Bill of 1871—a commendation in itself: for his was perhaps the most statesmanlike attempt made in recent times to grapple with the problem of licensing.

Without a large reduction in the number of licensed houses, in every part of the kingdom, there can be no adequate remedy, nor indeed appreciable change for the better. But that brings us face to face with the question of compensation—a question which must therefore be solved at the outset. Both the proposed measures just referred to deal with it, and on the same principle—that of a time limit. It is on that principle, I think, or on some similar compromise, that the question must be ultimately solved. There are those that say, the publican whose license lapses has no claim at all; and there are others who insist that if we want the public-houses closed, we must buy them out, if we would not inflict gross injury on a large

and deserving class of the community. If we have to buy them out, after a somewhat similar fashion as the Irish tenant is now buying out his landlord, and if the taxpayer is to pay the bill, I fear we should have to wait long for any sweeping or satisfactory change. In view of the reasons set forth on behalf of the *ousted* publican, on the other hand, we should perhaps be prepared to admit that he had "vested rights of a qualified kind," and that he at least had a claim for something that may be called compensation or "equitable consideration." "As far as the interests of Temperance are concerned," said Archbishop Vaughan, at one of the conferences, "it might be to their interest to suppress all the public-houses at once if they could. But was there not some equitable consideration due to those publicans who, till the other day, were popularly supposed to have legal vested rights?"

A compromise of a different, and, I think, of a less satisfactory kind, was that proposed by the late Government. They would have the publicans whose licenses had been withdrawn, compensated, by their more fortunate neighbours, whose licenses were still granted. But the question would arise as to the selection of those to be continued, by some principle not unlike the "survival of the fittest;" as well as the perhaps more difficult one, as to whether the licensees remaining would be able and willing to pay, wherever the reduction in the number had become considerable.

The question of the licensing authority is another matter about which a considerable diversity of opinion prevails. Local optionists, and generally those who would be described as holding extreme views, are strongly in favour of boards elected *ad hoc*, and directly by the people. Without this, they hold one can never know the feelings of the community on the Temperance question; and it is undesirable to add to the duties of our local councils, or to complicate still further the elections to them. On the other hand, there seems a strong prejudice against the multiplication of local boards, and of the elections necessary to constitute them. In the proposals we are criticising, the licensing authority is the Council; but, as stated already, a special sub-committee *ad hoc* is to be appointed by the Council. In one of the conferences, it was suggested, as a possible means of reconciling the different views just mentioned, that simultaneously with the election for the Council, there should be a special one *ad hoc* for the licensing committee.

The only remaining point to which I would draw attention is what I may term the Direct Popular Veto Clause of the proposals. It goes some distance to meet the views of the party of prohibition; and Sir W. Lawson wrote in reply to an invitation: "I am about the worst man whom you could select for a committee for the consideration of a Bill for the regulation of the drink traffic, as I have spent most of my life in trying to destroy it. I quite recognize, however, that your Bill aims at trusting the public with a certain power to protect themselves." There is indeed the Direct Veto, but of a very modified kind; and no one can say that the right of minorities is overlooked. One tenth of the ratepayers may demand a poll on the question of License or No License; but it would require three-fourths to secure prohibition. The clause would probably but rarely come into operation; but there is some comfort for prohibitionists in the thought that even the most moderate people are prepared, in given circumstances, to give the public the right of self-protection to the fullest extent, if they choose to use it. In Canada, Australia, and generally where Local Option or Prohibition laws exist, a smaller majority suffices; and strong efforts were made, but in vain, at the Manchester conferences to substitute a two-thirds for a three-fourths majority.

From what has been said it may seem to be implied that almost any change in our licensing system would be for the better. For those who have given the whole subject but little thought, this might seem only one of those well-meant exaggerations which some people always expect from Temperance advocates; and I may therefore be allowed to give the following little example, of the "fruits of the traffic" as it exists in our midst. It happened in an English city, where efforts in the cause of Temperance have been made for a quarter of a century, as earnest and as persistent as in any part of the world, and chiefly by one devoted priest; and where, notwithstanding, the "fruits of the traffic" are as widespread and as appalling. In Liverpool, in one of its most public thoroughfares, in the window of a large public-house, the following appeared in brilliantly-illuminated letters:

WANTED AT ONCE,

ONE HUNDRED WOMEN to join — Spirit Club; 6d., 4d., and ad. per week for twelve weeks. Each member will be entitled for—

SIXPENCE PER WEEK.—One pint of rum, one pint of Irish whisky, one pint of gin or wine.

FOURPENCE PER WEEK.—Half-pint of rum, half-pint of whisky, half-pint of gin and wine, half-gallon of bitter beer.

TWOPENCE PER WEEK.—Half-pint of rum, half-pint of whisky.

That such an invitation as this should be tolerated by public opinion, and that there should be no legal means of preventing it, is a disgrace to our boasted civilization. No wonder the editor of the paper that published it, appended the question: How long will England put up with such enormities? and I may conclude by repeating: How long?

JAMES HALPIN.



## *On the Condition of Unbaptized Children after Death.*

---

IF we calculate the number of those who die every year all over the world at twenty millions, of whom about a third part die before they attain the age of reason, we shall have some six to seven millions who die annually without committing any serious sin. I shall waive for the present the much debated question, whether any of these have committed any venial sin, and shall assume that all these children are free from any actual sin whatever, and are stained by no stain save that of original sin, inherited from their forefather Adam. Out of these six or seven millions, at least four to five millions die unbaptized. We are therefore, in examining into the future condition of the unbaptized, examining into the eternal destiny, not of thousands, or of tens of thousands, but of hundreds of millions of the human race.

I shall begin by the safe method of putting forward the authorized teaching of the infallible decrees of the Church respecting all who thus die in original sin alone. I shall then proceed to the various opinions of the doctors, saints, and theologians of the Church, and so I shall try and draw out from these as far as I can, what we may regard as the opinion that we ourselves should hold as being in accordance with the spirit of the Church, the teaching of the most enlightened theologians, and the dictates of right reason and common sense.

First of all, we learn from our Lord's words to Nicodemus, that "Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot see the Kingdom of God."<sup>1</sup> This saying of our Lord excludes from the Beatific Vision all children who die unbaptized, and who do not supply for the baptism of water by the baptism of desire, or the baptism of blood. This has been the constant doctrine of the Catholic Church against the Pelagians, who said that it was possible for infants to attain

<sup>1</sup> St. John iii. 5.



eternal life without being baptized. This, then, we may take for granted, that without Baptism no little child, under the Christian dispensation, enters the Kingdom of Heaven.

But here we must not omit to notice that we are speaking of the Christian dispensation, and of it alone. Among the Jews there was provided by Almighty God a ceremony of the Old Law that was a kind of anticipation of Baptism, and was the occasion of freeing the child on whom it was performed from original sin. In the case of Jewish boys the common opinion is that circumcision carried with it this purification from the taint of Adam's sin; in the case of female infants it is supposed that there was some form of offering the child to God, in virtue of which it was received into the heritage of grace. In Patriarchal days we must suppose some such ceremony of oblation to have been instituted for boys and girls alike, for we cannot suppose that all the children of the servants of God before the time of Abraham, were shut out for ever from the Kingdom of Heaven if they died in infancy. How long such traditional offering lasted on outside the Jewish Covenant we do not know; it may be that during the whole period previous to the coming of our Lord, those who were believers in the true God had the opportunity of obtaining from Him the deliverance of their little children from original sin, when they offered them to be His, and dedicated them, according to the best of their ability and knowledge, to His service. Nay, we may even hope that in the present day the dweller in lands where the name of Christ is still unknown, may save their children, as they certainly can save themselves, from the eternal loss of God, if they offer their little ones to Him with a recognition of Him as their all-powerful King and Lord.

But granting all this, and opening the door of Heaven to as many as we can of the poor little ones who die unbaptized, we have nevertheless to allow that the great majority of infants who die before the age of reason, even in these Christian days, die with the guilt of original sin still upon them, and are excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven. One or two Catholic theologians have expressed an opinion, or indulged a hope that God gives to all such, at the last moment of their lives, a supernatural grace, whereby they are justified before God, and so qualified for entrance into Heaven. Such an opinion is, however, untenable in the face of the teaching of the Catholic Church which assumes that there are many who die in original sin,

without having committed any actual sin. Nor again can we admit the opinion of Cajetan, who asserts that the children of Christian and Catholic parents, who without any fault on their parents' part, die without Baptism, can according to God's ordinary providence, be saved by the prayers of their parents. Here and there it may be that God by an extraordinary intervention in behalf of some one of His faithful servants, may grant such a privilege to some favoured little one, but only by a very special miracle of grace, and as a rare exception to the general law. We have, therefore, still some millions of infants dying every year, who will for ever be excluded from the vision of God.

What becomes of them? On this point we have the infallible decree of the Council of Florence to guide us, though its words are so carefully guarded that there still remains room for no small divergence of opinion respecting their state.

The words of the Council are as follows: "The souls of those who depart this life in actual mortal sin or in original sin alone, soon after death go down to Hell, but the penalty to which they will be subjected will be very different indeed."<sup>1</sup> We must dwell for a little on this decree, because it is a most instructive instance of the danger of interpreting the teaching of the Church without theological knowledge, and a very careful consideration of the terminology employed. The translation of the words used by the Council, if rendered literally by one who knew not how words have a technical meaning in Catholic theology, and with what exceeding care the Councils of the Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, frame their decrees, would run as follows: "The souls of those who depart this life in actual mortal sin, or in original sin alone, soon after death go down to Hell, but to be *punished with unequal punishments*." But such a rendering of the original is quite incorrect. *Pœna* does not mean *punishment* in our ordinary use of the word, to which we attach some idea of pain endured for wrong done, but includes all privation of a good otherwise to be conferred, when such privation is traceable to a fault committed either by the individual who suffers the punishment or by some one who may be said to represent him, whether the reason

<sup>1</sup> "(Diffinimus) illorum animas, qui in actuali mortali peccato vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, disparibus tamen pœnis puniendas." (*Decr. Unionis. Græc. Denz. 588.*)

why it was not conferred lay in the power of him who loses it or not, and also whether he feels any conscious pain from the privation or not. So again the word *dispar* does not indicate mere inequality, like *impar*, but a complete difference and even contrast. In the same way there is an opposition of kind and not of degree alone between *favour* and *disfavour*, *like* and *dislike*. Hence it does not follow that if those who die in actual sin suffer some positive pain after death, that therefore those who die in original sin alone will suffer the same kind of suffering in a lesser degree, but on the contrary the use of the word *dispar* implies a certain disparity and a contrast between their state.

This interpretation receives a signal confirmation from a decree of Innocent IV. against the Waldenses, in which he says, "The penalty of original sin is the loss (*carentia*) of the vision of God, but the penalty of actual sin is the torment of an eternal Gehenna (*perpetuæ gehennæ cruciatus*)." No one can read these words without seeing that the object of the Pontiff was to remove any possible ambiguity in the Florentine decree, by an explicit statement of the contrast that is only implied in the phrase used by the Council. But to render assurance doubly sure, we have yet another Papal utterance the purport of which is still more unmistakable. The Pelagian heretics had taught that beside Heaven and Hell there was in the world to come some third state, to which among others the souls of infants who die unbaptized would be consigned. The Synod of Pistoja, held in 1794, had passed among its other false and censurable decrees, one respecting infants dying unbaptized. It had not only condemned the Pelagian teaching on the subject, but had run into an opposite error by attributing to those who deny that these little ones will suffer the penalty of fire, a participation in the Pelagian heresy. The then reigning Pontiff, Pius VI., includes in the eighty-five propositions condemned by him in the decrees of the synod, its decree respecting the unbaptized, and censures it in terms which leave no doubt whatever as to the mind of the Church on the matter. The words of the Pontifical censure are as follows: "The doctrine which disallows as a fable of the Pelagians that place in the lower regions, which the faithful everywhere designate by the name of the 'Limbo of children,' in which the souls of those that depart this life with original sin alone, suffer a penalty which does not include the penalty of fire, as if by this very fact that they take away the

penalty of fire, they were bringing in that middle place and state, free from guilt and penalty, midway between the Kingdom of God and eternal condemnation, such as the Pelagians romance about (*fabulantur*)—such doctrine is false, temerarious, and an insult to the teaching of the Catholic theologians." About the purport of this censure there can be but one opinion. It defends against the attacks of the Synod of Pistoja the theory of a place in the lower world, called the *limbus puerorum*, where there is no pain of sense, and simply that negative pain of loss which consists in the absence of the Beatific Vision.<sup>1</sup>

2. We do not say that the above decrees establish certainly a total absence of suffering on the part of these poor little ones who die in original sin. If they exempt them from the pain of fire, and from all pain of sense, it does not follow that they may not experience a still greater pain from their deprivation of the unspeakable joy of Heaven. It is therefore necessary, in order to arrive at a clear judgment respecting their condition, to see what is the general teaching of the most eminent of the Fathers and theologians of the Church, and what are the grounds on which their opinions are based.

We will begin with the Fathers, and first of all with St. Augustine, whose name has always been prominent in this controversy, as holding the severe view on the subject. He

<sup>1</sup> There is a fourth decree cited by a learned modern theologian who takes the severer view of the future of these children. - From the Plenary Council of Carthage, held in 417, he quotes a decree, which will at first strike the gentle reader with distress and perplexity. The purport of the decree is that the words of our Lord, "In My Father's house are many mansions," do not mean that in the world to come there is any third place beside Heaven and Hell, in which children who die unbaptized will be consigned. This of course is true; but it continues: "For since our Lord said, 'Unless a man be born again,' &c., what Catholic can doubt that that man is a partner with the devil who has not deserved to be a co-heir with Christ? For he who is not on the right hand, without doubt will incur the fate of those on the left." These terrible words can scarcely be explained as referring to any except the poor little ones mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The Council in question was not an œcumenical one, and therefore though its decrees would carry great weight, they are not infallible. But we have no need to resort to this escape from the supposed decree. For, when we turn to the little handbook of Conciliar definitions which is used by all Catholic students, we find it inserted indeed, but in brackets, with the note that it is found only in *some* records of the Council. When we pursue our search and read the decrees as they are given in the magnificent compilation of Mansi, which is recognized by all as our standard authority on the genuineness of the decrees attributed to the Councils, we not only do not find it given as either a genuine or as a doubtful decree, but we find no trace of it whatever in the list of the various decrees of the Council. Either it was never passed at all, but interpolated by some unscrupulous rigorist, or else it was not confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, and so became null and void.

seems to have based his opinion on the words of our Lord to be spoken at the Judgment to those on His left hand, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." On the one hand, he says, there is the Kingdom of Heaven for the just, on the other, there is damnation with the devil. "No intermediate place is left, where you can place the infants. . . . Whoever is not received into the Kingdom will without doubt be sent into the eternal fire. . . ." In another place he meets the possible evasion, that some might be sent into the eternal fire, without being burned therein, in these words: "Nor can we say, as some falsely persuade themselves, that it is eternal fire that is spoken of, not eternal burning. . . . For our Lord foreseeing this, ends His sentence with these words, 'These shall go into everlasting burning, but the just into everlasting life.'<sup>1</sup> There will therefore be everlasting burning, as there will be everlasting fire."<sup>2</sup>

This doctrine, however, seems to have jarred on the compassionate instincts of the Saint, and in several passages he dwells on the fact that the punishment of these infants will be a *mitissima damnatio*. "Most mild of all," he says in his *Enchiridion*,<sup>3</sup> "will be the penalty of those who beside the original sin that they have contracted, have added no actual sin beside, and in those who have so added, the damnation of each will be the more tolerable, as he shall have added the less iniquity." And again: "It may then be rightly said, that infants who depart from the body without Baptism will be in the mildest damnation of all. . . . But he is much deceived, and deceives others, who proclaims that they will not be in any damnation at all."<sup>4</sup> This last sentiment does not mean in St. Augustine's mouth that they will only suffer the pain of loss, for he says elsewhere,<sup>5</sup> that in the unbaptized child there is a certain liability (*reatus*) which makes him owe the debt of eternal suffering (*supplicium*). This doctrine of the Saint seems to have caused him considerable perplexity. When we come to the penalties inflicted on infants, he says: "I am, believe me, hemmed in by no small difficulties, and I am quite at a loss what to answer."<sup>6</sup> Lastly, unable to reconcile with the justice and mercy

<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine must have had before him here a MS. with the word καίσιν substituted for κόλασιν.

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustin. Serm. xiv. *De Verbis Apostoli*, c. iii. ; *De Fide et opp.* c. xv.

<sup>3</sup> C. 93.

<sup>4</sup> *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, c. xvi.

<sup>5</sup> *De Nuptiis et Concup.* ad Val. c. 36.

<sup>6</sup> Ep. 28.

of God the theory that little ones are to be left to all eternity in a condition of actual misery, he admits that though they suffer pain, though they are in a state of damnation, yet that there is more happiness than suffering in their condition. "Though I cannot define the nature of their condemnation, yet I do not dare to say that it would have been better for them not to exist than to exist as they now are."<sup>1</sup>

If the view taken by St. Augustine is somewhat severe, that of another of the Latin Fathers is still more harsh in the sentence that he passes on these unfortunate infants. St. Fulgentius, another African Bishop, lays down as a dogma of the faith that they are to suffer the punishment of eternal fire in everlasting torments (*ignis æterni sempiterno supplicio puniendos*), and gives as his reason that, though they have committed no actual sin, yet they have by their carnal conception of birth incurred the damnation due to original sin."<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere in the same treatise<sup>3</sup> he says, that though they have lived but a single hour in the body, they must in the same body endure the interminable torments of Gehenna. The same Father repeats the same sentiments in another passage in still more unsparing language. In his *De Veritate Prædestinationis*,<sup>4</sup> he tells us that the little one who is carried off in infancy is not carried off in order that his sufferings may be diminished, but in order that he may not escape the sufferings to which he is predestined. This last passage lets us into the secret of what we cannot help calling the cruel attitude taken by St. Fulgentius towards this question. He seems to have entertained an opinion respecting predestination that gave a dark and gloomy colour to his conception of the fate of the poor little ones who were doomed in the eternal decrees of God to be banished from Him for ever, and to find their place with the devil and his angels in Hell. St. Gregory the Great did not escape the influence of the traditional severity which prevailed among the leading theologians of the African school. In the ninth book of his *Moralia*,<sup>5</sup> he adopts the sentiments of St. Augustine and St. Fulgentius. But he speaks only as a private Doctor, and his utterances have no sort of official authority attaching to them.

Thus we see that in the earlier ages of the Church there were several men of great learning and sanctity who held that these poor children actually suffered for a sin in which they had

<sup>1</sup> *Contra. Jul.* lib. v. c. xi.

<sup>2</sup> *De Fide ad Patrum*, c. 27.

<sup>3</sup> C. 3.

<sup>4</sup> C. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Mor.* c. 12.



no actual share. The harshness, not to say the injustice, of such an opinion is only to be accounted for by a misunderstanding of some expressions in the Epistles of St. Paul, from which they were led to take a view of the doctrine of predestination, which in an exaggerated and perverted form was afterwards distorted into the doctrine of Calvinism. Once persuaded that God predestines men to eternal misery without giving them any full freedom to escape their doom, it was only natural that they should include in the victims of the unscrutable judgments of the Creator little children as well as adults.

That this severe view was never the general doctrine of the Church, is sufficiently clear from the decree of the Council of Florence that we have already quoted,<sup>1</sup> as well as from the Papal utterances of Innocent IV. and Pius VI., which are still more decided in the leniency of their sentiments. It is curious to see how the language of theologians varies with the temper of the age and country to which they belonged, in contrast with the uniform and unvarying teaching of the Church herself. So it is with the generally prevalent opinion as to the number of the saved. In the early days of the Church, the door of Heaven was regarded as closed except to a small minority, according to what we may gather from certain writers of the first few centuries. But gradually a gentler view prevailed, and the exclusiveness of the first ages was exchanged for a far more liberal spirit. So with the condition of the unbaptized. Since the days of St. Thomas, there are but a very small minority who would echo the sentiments of St. Augustine, while those of St. Fulgentius are universally rejected as false. The whole matter is treated by the Angelic Doctor with his accustomed clearness of reasonable argument; and we cannot do better than follow him in his discussion of the question.

In his Commentary on the Sentences<sup>1</sup> he discusses the question whether the pain of sense is due to original sin in itself. First of all he adduces the authority of St. Fulgentius in favour of the harsher view, and answers it by explaining the words of the Saint as referring only to the pain of loss, an explanation which we can scarcely regard as tenable in view of the passages we have quoted above. It may be that St. Thomas, in his reverence for the Saint, considered himself bound to defend him, even at the risk of somewhat straining the sense of the expressions he employs. But be that as it may, the opinion

<sup>1</sup> In lib. ii. Sent. Dist. 33, q. 2, art. 1.

of the Angelic Doctor is unmistakable. After discussing several arguments which seemed to favour the actual suffering of those who died in original sin only, he gives the true doctrine as follows: "Every penalty must be in proportion to the guilt of him who suffers it. Now the defect that original sin carries with it, and which has the nature of guilt, is not the result of the taking away or marring of some good that human nature arrives at from its own principles, but of the taking away or marring of something that is added to human nature. The guilt of original sin does not attach to the individual, except so far as he has a nature which has been deprived of a good which belonged to it at the first and might have been preserved (supernatural grace). Hence no other penalty can be due to the individual, except the loss of that end for which the gift of which it was deprived entitled it, and which gift human nature could not attain to of itself. This gift is the vision of God, and therefore the loss of it will be the only penalty of original sin after death. If any other sensible punishment were inflicted for it, the punishment would not correspond to the guilt; for all sensible punishment belongs to that which is personal to the individual, and is the effect of some action of his own. Hence as original sin does not attach to any one through anything that he has done, so the penalty cannot consist in any suffering on his part, but only in the loss of that for which nature was in itself insufficient, *i.e.*, the vision of God." In other words no one can justly suffer positive pain unless he himself has done some positive wrong; the absence therefore of any wrong-doing on the part of those who die in original sin alone forbids their suffering any positive pain, and deprives them only of that superadded gift of glory to which human nature cannot attain, except in so far as it is raised above itself by the supernatural power of God.

In the following article St. Thomas discusses a further question. It may be said that infants dying unbaptized, though they are not liable to the pain of sense, yet feel an intense sorrow at the thought of what they have lost. The holy Doctor first puts the arguments that seem to prove the conclusion opposed to his own. (1) Though the children do not suffer the pain of sense, yet they suffer what is by common consent far worse, *viz.*, the pain of loss. (2) To lose what we know we might have had always causes pain; now the children who die unbaptized will know that they might have attained to the Beatific Vision, and the knowledge that they have lost it will cause them



unending sorrow. (3) These little ones will be eternally separated from God; now to be separated from God is the greatest of all possible miseries to those who were made for union with God, as these children. Hence they will suffer the greatest misery for ever.

To all this the Saint answers that every man who has the full use of his free-will has eternal life within his reach, because he can prepare himself for that grace by which he will merit eternal life, and if he fails of this he will suffer the greatest of all possible sufferings. But children never have it within their reach; they have no power of performing acts by which they merit grace; it exceeds all their natural powers. The vision of God is therefore entirely out of their reach. They will feel no pain for the loss of it; nay, they will be full of joy at the large share they will have in God's goodness through the natural perfections that they will enjoy. It is true that they will be eternally separated from God as regards any supernatural union with Him; but they will be most closely united to Him in the natural order. They will feel no pain at the loss of what altogether exceeds their natural powers, even though they know that they can never attain to it. It causes a man no pain because he cannot fly like a bird, or pass from one end of the world to the other, as an angel can. In the same way we may say that it causes an ordinary individual no sorrow because he is not a king or emperor, or because he has not the genius of Mozart, or of Goethe, or of Fra Angelico. To grieve over their loss would be in these infants an inordinate act of their will, and this is impossible to their nature, which has never been marred by actual sin. It would be contrary to right reason, and this is impossible for those who have never sinned. They will know full well what they have lost, not with the supernatural appreciation of those who are raised to the supernatural order, but with a natural knowledge corresponding to their condition; and this knowledge will cause them no more sorrow than is caused to the sensible, happy, well-to-do rustic when he hears of the magnificence of some Eastern palace, or of the treasures of some American millionaire.

Most theologians since the time of St. Thomas have followed in his footsteps as regards this question. There are indeed one and another who seem to grudge the poor children the fulness of natural beatitude. One of the principal of these is

Cardinal Bellarmine, and the reasons that he gives for differing from the opinion of St. Thomas are worthy of our consideration. It is perfectly true, he says,<sup>1</sup> that these little ones will know that their nature is one that is in itself insufficient for the attainment of the Beatific Vision, yet they will also know that Adam their progenitor had gifts that qualified him for it, and that he lost them through his own fault, and by that loss was the means of depriving them too of that inestimable gift, and of the unspeakable joy of Heaven. At the same time he admits that they will not suffer very acutely from a loss so remote.

Now if one who had a moderate competency, and all that satisfied and more than satisfied his wants, were to learn that one of his ancestors, at some very remote period, had forfeited a magnificent estate, which might possibly have otherwise come down to him, we cannot imagine that he would feel very serious pain at the possible loss that he had suffered. All that we can say is that possibly some slight tinge of regret might cast a faint shadow over the full perfection of his satisfaction, when he adverted to the fortune that had been forfeited. If we are to suppose that of the estate he knew nothing, that he had never seen it, and only heard of it by a sort of distant rumour, the feeling of regret would practically disappear. If we add to this that he had continually before his eyes a number of those who had been in the same circumstances as himself, and who, through having been exposed to dangers from which he had been saved, had not only forfeited a splendid property, but been reduced to hopeless misery and distress, would not the thought of the suffering he had escaped swallow up altogether any possible feeling of regret at the folly of his ancestor, and fill him with continual gratitude to the benefactor who had delivered him from the ruin that had befallen so many others? No wonder, then, that Bellarmine describes this sorrow to be suffered eternally by these infants as most light and mild. Nay, we think we may go still further and say that it will be a vanishing point as compared with their unceasing happiness in the natural order, and that we may regard Bellarmine's objection to the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor as rather a formal protest, based on a laudable desire to save the teaching of St. Augustine and the school of severity, rather than as indicating any serious departure from the doctrine of St. Thomas.

It is quite unnecessary to go through the opinions of the

<sup>1</sup> *De amissione gratiæ*, vi. 6.

modern theologians who have discussed the fate of the little children of whom I am speaking. They may be divided into three classes. (1) Those who are apparently misled by the words of the Council of Florence, and maintain that all unbaptized infants suffer not only the pain of loss, but the pain of sense also. One of these theologians<sup>1</sup> actually asserts that though there is a difference between the torment of the unbaptized children and those who die in mortal sin, in the burning common to both of them, yet the pain of the torturing flames is one and the same (*una est flammaram cruciantium pena*). Another<sup>2</sup> describes these infants as enemies of God and sons of wrath, as captives and under the power of the devil, as shut up in Hell, and there to remain, and as not enjoying any natural happiness. (2) The second class consists of those who like Bellarmine exempt them from the pain of sense, but think that they will suffer some sadness by reason of the loss that they have sustained. Thus one of the most learned of modern theologians says that the opinion is to be preferred which does not exempt them from all evil, at least not from the penalty of sadness, which will however be very gentle, so that it will be better for them to exist than not to exist, and gives them some knowledge of God, some love of Him, and some joy, arising from the benefit they have received in being saved from the awful lot of those who die in mortal sin.<sup>3</sup> (3) The third class consists of those who follow in the footsteps of St. Thomas, and believe that these children will enjoy unmixed natural happiness, without any sort of suffering whatever; that they will be as closely united to God as is possible in the natural order; and that they will enjoy such happiness as Adam would have enjoyed, if on the one hand he had never sinned, and on the other had not been raised to the supernatural order. This last is the opinion of Billuart and the Thomists generally, of St. Bonaventure, Scotus, Cardinal Sfrondati, Peter Lombard, Lessius, Perrone, and others. At the present time it is not only the *opinio communior*, but *communissima*, and the only reason why it is not universal seems to be inconsistent with the Council of Florence.

What then is to be our general conclusion?

1. That it is of faith that these children are excluded from the Beatific Vision, and are thereby subject to an infinite loss; that they are to be included in the number of those who in technical

<sup>1</sup> Petavius, *De Præd.* 9, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Kilber, *De pecc. original.* 136.

<sup>3</sup> Hurter, *De Deo Consumm.* c. iii.

language are said to be *damnati*, i.e., who suffer the loss of God (*damnum*) to all eternity. The happiness of which they are deprived is one which is out of all compare with that which even the most gentle theologians would assign to them. For of the joys of Heaven St. Paul tells us that eye has not seen, ear has not heard, and it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive what joys God has prepared for those who love Him; whereas the joy of these children will be at best a joy that man has already tasted here on earth, and will not in any way transcend our natural powers, or the varied delights that this world affords to those who enjoy God's gifts to the utmost.

2. That at all events it is better for these children to exist than not to exist. Even those who take the harshest view would with perhaps one or two exceptions concede this. Even if they should be actually suffering some pain of sense, yet all must suppose, if we are to believe in the justice of God, to say nothing of His love and mercy, that their pleasures exceed their pains, and that their *damnatio* is indeed what St. Augustine calls it, a *damnatio levissima ac mitissima*.

3. That the idea that these little ones suffer any pain of sense is one to be rejected on the ground of right reason, to say nothing of compassion and charity. The pain of sense, as St. Thomas says, is the penalty for the inordinate *conversio ad creaturas* of which these children have never been guilty. Or as St. Bernard says: Nothing in Hell is in the flames except self-will, and of self-will these little ones were happily incapable.

4. That the most probable opinion is that of the Angelic Doctor; viz., that they suffer no sort of pain or sadness whatever, but that their existence is one unbroken round of continual joy and happiness,<sup>1</sup> that of them it is true that God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and that among them there shall be no more sorrow or crying, neither shall there be any more pain. Nay, we may piously suppose that the angels often come to be their companions; that the saints hold sweet converse with them respecting such natural knowledge of God and of Divine things as their unregenerate nature is capable of; that our Lady sometimes visits them to add additional brightness and joy to their happy home,

<sup>1</sup> "They will have no small share (says St. Thomas) in the goodness of God and in natural perfections. They will be joined to God by a communion of natural gifts, and so they will rejoice in Him (*habitueros gaudium de ipso*) from their natural knowledge and love of Him." (*In Dist. vi. 33. 2. 2.*)

and that even our Lord Himself vouchsafes to come down from Heaven, to give them the inexpressible delight of beholding the fairest among the sons of men, not indeed in His Divine glory, for of this they are incapable, but at least with the sweet attractiveness that will make the sight of Him, veiled though He will be from the eyes of these poor children as regards His supernatural loveliness, the greatest possible happiness of which their mere natural faculties are capable of enjoying. If the Lamb that is on the Throne will not dwell among them, though they will not be able to follow Him whithersoever He goeth, though He will not lead them to those living fountains of water to which the children of the Kingdom will drink draughts of indescribable sweetness, yet His presence will at least rejoice their hearts with a most intense delight, as the presence of God delighted the hearts of our first parents in Eden before they fell.

5. It is not absolutely certain that the joy of these unredeemed children of God will never be overcast by any cloud of sorrow. It may be that there will be present to their minds the knowledge that there is a far higher, nobler state, in comparison with which their own condition is almost a joyless one, and the happiness of which not only surpasses theirs as the mighty waters of the ocean surpass in bulk those of some tiny pool, but differs from it in kind, as the pure gold from the brass, or the sparkling diamond from the bit of glass. It may be that when they think of this and how it might have been theirs if Adam had not sinned, or if their parents had poured on their heads the saving waters of Baptism, some little cloud of sadness and regret will overshadow the perfection of their joy. But it will not in any way seriously impair their happiness; for they will be so completely conformed to the will of God, that it will be a greater satisfaction to them to know that His holy will is carried out in their regard, than it would be to have attained, apart from His Divine will, to a condition altogether beyond their natural powers and of which they will know nothing, and the loss of which will therefore cause them no serious pang of sorrow.

6. These children will not be the enemies of God, as some theologians have asserted, but will be united to Him in the natural order, as far as their state allows. They will not be His children by grace; they will be aliens and strangers from the Heavenly Kingdom; they will be excluded from all

supernatural friendship with God or love of Him. But this is very different from being His enemies. Nor is it true to say that they will be in the power of the devil, or members of his kingdom. For then the devil will be himself an eternal captive in the fire prepared for him. He may indeed have a certain power to add to the sufferings of those who have by wilful sin, thrown in their lot with him, and renounced God for ever. But to these happy children in their home of joy, he will never approach. No messenger of evil will disturb their peace; for where no actual sin is found, there Satan cannot be.

7. Yet we must never forget the terrible and immeasurable loss that is suffered by every little child who dies unbaptized—a loss that no words can describe, no thought conceive, no human intellect understand or appreciate. For whatever their happiness may be, these poor children remain for ever exiles, banished from the face of God, deprived of their inheritance in Heaven. Nor does their happiness in any way deserve the name, in comparison with the unspeakable glory and joy of those blessed little ones who, washed in the saving waters of Baptism, gaze on the unveiled vision of God, and with the angels and saints rejoice before Him in the celestial Paradise.

R. F. C.



## *St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572.*

---

A wicked day, and not a holiday !  
(*King John*, Act iii. Sc. 1.)

---

ONLY fanaticism of the venerable and 'antique type which in quite recent times howled down a gentleman of acknowledged culture and integrity at the Guildhall, because it fancied it saw behind the civic chair of a Catholic Lord Mayor visions of racks, thumbscrews, and the lurid light of the Smithfield fires, is any longer equal to the assertion, often made and never yet retracted, that not content with butchering the Huguenots by thousands on St. Bartholomew's day, in the year of grace 1572, Catholics continue down to this very hour to defend and applaud the massacre, nay, even to keep the anniversary as a day of high celebration. With bigotry of this ignorant sort disclaimer and argument are alike unavailing ; we can but once again enter our indignant protest against the charge and, that done, contentedly leave the vindication of our character to time and that innate sense of justice and love of fair play which sooner or later bring Englishmen round to more equitable judgments about us. In the meantime, there is comfort in the knowledge that all do not think quite so evilly of us, that there are not a few, who if they cannot throw off their prepossessions so thoroughly as to give us a plenary absolution for all our sins in the past, and in particular for our complicity in the St. Bartholomew Massacre, are yet glad to believe that we are now at the eleventh hour not only heartily sorry for, but thoroughly ashamed of, our misconduct.

So far so good. Mercies, however small, ought to be acceptable to those who, in the matter I am about to discuss, have not been used to much fair or kind treatment. But we are not satisfied with this half-loaf pittance of charity. We want the whole loaf ; we do not ask for mercy, we demand justice. Anything short of justice, of a full acquittal from the guilt of the St. Bartholomew Massacre, is in our eyes as bad as no bread at

all. Either we are guilty or not guilty ; if the former, let us be straightway condemned without the benefit of extenuating circumstances ; if the latter, let us have an immediate discharge. We plead Not Guilty ; that we are no more to blame for the massacre, than we are responsible for the latest colliery or railway accident, that we come into court with absolutely clean hands, and that no verdict will satisfy us short of an explicit declaration that we leave it without a stain upon our character.

The history of mankind contains many a page as darkly stained with blood as that which records the St. Bartholomew Massacre. Why is the page turned down and the book kept perpetually open, ready for reference, at this most sorrowful chapter ? Why is this atrocious deed remembered, when other slaughterings quite as wanton and cruel, the September massacres in Paris, for example, or the fusillades at Lyons, or the drownings at Nantes at the close of last century, are, if not quite forgotten, at any rate seldom cast up as a reproach in the face of the French people ? The reason of the difference is obvious. The St. Bartholomew has been saved from oblivion, is still flourished defiantly in our eyes, still "bewept to many simple gulls" even in our day, for this reason and for no other, that in the popular Protestant judgment it tells as few other historical facts tell against the Catholic Church. In that judgment the hideous deed of blood was the outcome of a plot, long premeditated and carefully arranged, a conspiracy to which a couple of Popes were accessories, the one *before* and the other *after* the fact, for the extermination of Protestantism in France, over which, when it had been consummated in rivers of blood, Rome and with Rome all the Catholic world rejoiced as for a great triumph of truth over heresy. This, succinctly, is the Protestant tradition, carefully nursed and industriously transmitted from age to age, which has come to be accepted by the non-Catholic world as the undeniable truth about the massacre. Is it any wonder that Protestant controversialists find in it one of their readiest weapons of offence against us, that they are slow to forget it themselves or suffer us to forget it ? For if only the story they tell be the true story, our character is irretrievably gone.

Fortunately modern criticism has done a great deal to throw light on this dark subject by means of fresh diplomatic documents unearthed from the archives of Rome, France,



Spain, Venice, and Belgium, which, if they do not unravel all the tangle of this intricate question, are amply sufficient to put three things beyond all doubt. First, that the massacre was inspired by political, not religious motives; secondly, that the slaughter was not a matter of long, but of comparatively very short premeditation, if it was not actually a sudden impulse of wickedness; and thirdly, that the Church and the Holy See are in no way responsible for, or accomplices in, this most execrable deed. These three questions are so closely connected, that in answering one we are to some extent answering the others. For clearness' sake it will perhaps be best to take them separately and in the order in which I have just stated them.

The St. Bartholomew Massacre was a great crime committed by persons professing the Catholic faith. The guilt of it belongs to Charles IX. and his mother, with their councillors, and to no one else besides, except the actual executioners. We have the shame and the grief of confessing that the perpetrators of what the *Times* once called "the greatest crime, save one, ever committed," were, or rather ought to have been, Catholics—and that is all. To this extent, and to this extent only, has religion anything whatever to do with it. For nobody who is at all familiar with the history of Charles IX. and Catherine de' Medici can for a moment suppose that the massacre was wrought for any but political motives. So far was religion from being at the bottom of the mischief, that in the then state of men's minds nothing but religion could have prevented it. It is the absence, not the presence of religious motive, which is to blame. Apply a simple test to this assertion. Imagine for the nonce a very different set of characters and circumstances. Clear away the net of intrigue which entangled the Court of Charles IX., sweep it clean of the moral filth with which it reeked, fancy it governed by the principles of the Gospel, set Blanche of Castille and St. Louis on the French throne in the room of Catherine and Charles, and we may be as certain as we are of our own existence, that there would have been no cold-blooded murder done upon the Huguenots, no St. Bartholomew's Massacre at all. The truth is, there was as little real religion amongst the slayers as amongst the slain.

Of the two principal actors in the dismal tragedy, Charles IX. may be treated almost as a *quantité négligeable*. A poor creature at the best, of sickly body and stunted mind, knowing only in vice, he took his cue from his mother and went blindly

by her direction. With her the case is very different. To charge her, whom the late Louis Veuillot once aptly described as *moins reine qu' Euménide*, with zeal for religion in dooming the Huguenots to slaughter is about as reasonable as to impute the same exalted motive to little M. Thiers, when he shot his Communists down in the streets of Paris or on the plain of Satory. In name a Catholic, in manners a pagan, a freethinker of the school of Machiavelli with a leaning to the occult sciences, caring nothing for religion and everything for power, ready to use Calvinism, which she hated and despised, when it served her purpose, and no less ready, when it stood in her way, to trample it under her feet, she had as much love and reverence for the Vicar of Christ as her royal sister Elizabeth over the way. Like Henry VIII. she was quite willing to put the gold of the Church into her pocket and the Triple Crown itself on her head, but she had not the least idea of placing her purse, or her sceptre, or her head at the disposal of the Admiral of Châtillon. She was perfectly prepared to wreck the old faith of France by connivance with heresy, but not to risk the monarchy or her own hold of power by compromising overmuch with faction and rebellion.<sup>1</sup> She had come to terms more than once with the Huguenots, but seeing in the end that the bargain would not hold, because, its patience exhausted, France would no longer ratify it, she fell back like the Italian she was on the resources of her native cunning, and unable to subdue her enemies in the open day, adopted the plan of assassinating them treacherously in the darkness of night. Zeal for religion had so little place in the calculations of this false woman, that, when in the secret council held immediately before the massacre she urged her wretched son to adopt her plan of midnight murder, she never once invoked the name of religion, but exhorted him to rid himself at one blow of enemies who had never shown the least respect either for his person or for his authority.<sup>2</sup> Zeal for religion, therefore, was not the motive of the massacre—this will appear still more clearly as we proceed—it had no hand at all in the deadly work; in the words of the canny Scot, who failed to see any necessary con-

<sup>1</sup> "Il re e la madre, come V.S. sa, erano venuti a tale, che si dubbitava, se fossero heretici. Ed io da fanciullo ho sentito pubblicamente nominare la Regina fomentatrice d'heresie." (*Vatican Arch. Armar.* 64, vol. 31; Copia d'una lettera del Padre Panicarola, da Parigi, 26 Agosto, 1572. See *Zeitschrift f. Geschwsh.* Jahrgang, 1892. Erstes Heft, in note p. 110.)

<sup>2</sup> Bossuet, *Abrégé de l'Hist. de France; Règne de Charles IX.*

nection between the religiousness of a town and the number of its churches and chapels: "It was no religious zeal ava', but just cursedness of temper." It was a hellish deed conceived in the crafty brain of Catherine, begotten in great measure of her jealousy of Coligny, and wrought in the unrestrained fury of passion by a people burning to deal a final blow of summary vengeance on its hated enemy.

If the Court, then, is not open to the imputation of an excessive zeal for religion, can as much be said, it may be asked, for the French clergy in general, who, as H. Martin, Soldan, Dargaud, and other non-Catholic writers would have us believe, in many places actually encouraged the assassins in their bloody work, and when it was done went and gave solemn thanks to God in His churches for its success?

Baseless allegations of this sweeping kind are a manifest invention of the enemy, of writers notoriously hostile to the Catholic religion, whose malignant attempt to connect the illustrious Church of France with deeds of perfidious cruelty, such as the St. Bartholomew Massacre, has not the faintest chance of success except by the deliberate perversion or the dishonest suppression of historical facts. It is remarkable how rarely we come upon the name of any ecclesiastic in the history of the massacre, and how when we do encounter bishop or priest it is only to find them, as might have been expected, taking a firm stand on the side of humanity. Nothing is more certain than that the French clergy, as a body, with few if any exceptions, were not only innocent of all participation in the crime of Charles IX., but that in many instances they successfully opposed it, often at the risk of their lives, and that, when not deceived as to its true character, they sternly condemned it. No bishop and no priest was present at the deliberations in which the massacre was decreed. Cut-throat clerics with a crucifix in one hand and a dagger in the other are no doubt effective enough figures on the stage, and would be more thrilling still if they were only more real, historical and not merely melodramatic personages. The Cardinal of Lorraine, in particular, who is sometimes depicted busy in Paris blessing poniards to be presently plunged in the palpitating hearts of recreant Huguenots, was away all this time in Rome, whither he had gone for the Conclave which elected Pope Gregory XIII. as successor to St. Pius V.

So far from countenancing the slaughter, the prelates and

clergy of France, animated by the true spirit of Christ, were not seldom the defenders of the hunted Huguenots, screening them against the civil authorities and rescuing them from the hands of the populace, whose fury these same fanatics had done so much during long years of the most lawless and abominable excesses to bring down upon themselves in overwhelming retribution. At Lisieux, as all the world knows, the noble-hearted Bishop, Jean Hennuyer, saved a considerable number of Protestants from the hands of the infuriate people over whom the civil authorities had lost all control. At Toulouse the convents and monasteries took a glorious revenge for numberless past outrages on monk and nun by opening their doors and giving shelter to the persecuted Protestants. At Lyons the Archbishop received more than three hundred of them into his own palace, which the angry mob assailed and stormed to tear from his arms the victims his charity had in vain sought to protect. At Nantes and Montpellier the clergy were more successful, staying the massacre and saving the lives of great numbers whom they hid away in their houses till the danger was over. At Nîmes, which had been the scene of two of the most cold-blooded among their many atrocious massacres, the lives of numerous Huguenots were saved by the energetic interference of the clergy. In the words of Fleury, who does not usually sin by excessive praise: "The clergy in spite of all the ill-usage they had received from the heretics saved as many of them as they could in various places."<sup>1</sup> The clergy of Paris, it is true, threw open their churches and held services of thanksgiving as for a national deliverance, but they did so, because in company with the rest of the French people, the Pope, and many foreign Courts, they were deceived by Charles' declarations made before the Parliament of Paris and repeated in subsequent statements to all Europe, and were led to believe in the discovery of a Huguenot plot for the murder of the King, with all his Court, and for the overthrow of the Government, a conspiracy in which clemency or delay would have been fatal to the Church, the monarchy, and society.

In a word, if we except the cases in which heresy was only a cloak for rebellion or in which principles were propagated alike fatal to human society and subversive of religion and morality, there is no authentic evidence on record to attest that the action of the civil power in putting heretics to death was

<sup>1</sup> Fleury, tom. xxxv. c. xxxix. p. 170; Caveirac, tom. vii. p. 480.

ever approved by the Church in any country; that she could ever wittingly and deliberately lend her sanction to cold-blooded treachery and murder will be maintained only by that species of obstinate prejudice with which any attempt at argument is sheer waste of time.

Let us pass on to the vexed question, whether the massacre was or was not a matter of long premeditation. Down to the present century historians seem to have been about equally divided on the point. Non-Catholic writers who accused the Pope of a guilty knowledge of the crime felt the need of some such theory; for if it arose out of circumstances immediately preceding its perpetration the Holy See could have had no knowledge of it. The controversy has in our day been finally set at rest by the comparatively recent discovery and publication of manuscripts from the diplomatic correspondence of the sixteenth century, and in particular of the secret despatches written by Salviati, the Papal Nuncio at Paris, to the Cardinal Secretary at Rome for the information of the Sovereign Pontiff. The premeditation theory is now, therefore, universally rejected by writers of any name, who have made this subject a special study, such as Chateaubriand, who discovered the Salviati cypher, Soldan, Ranke, Lingard, H. Martin, Alzog, and others.<sup>1</sup> This theory long rested on a supposed secret treaty, alleged to have been concluded between France and Spain, in 1567, that is, five full years before the massacre, for the total extirpation of the Protestant religion. How, we might stop to inquire, how did this terrible secret come to be so thoroughly well kept—particularly amongst a people like the French, who, as Prosper Mérimée observes, are fond to excess of taking the world into their confidence—that the existence of the treaty has always been, at its best, so difficult of proof? Amongst ourselves Hallam<sup>2</sup> gives no credit to this league, as printed in Strype (i. 502), "which seems," he says, "to have been fabricated by some of the Queen's (Elizabeth's) emissaries." But let me first tell the story of the massacre, and comment on it afterwards.

The treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye concluded in August, 1570, had sent a thrill of shame and rage through the length and breadth of France. And no wonder, since it robbed the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. Cantu (French translation), vol. xv. Notes Additionnelles, F; Theiner, *Annales*, i. 42; Ranke, *Civil Wars*, &c. vol. ii. ch. i.

<sup>2</sup> *Const. Hist.* vol. i. ch. iii. p. 185.

victorious Catholics of all the advantages which they had won at the price of their best blood shed on the fields of Jarnac and Moncontour, to hand them over to the hated and vanquished Huguenots, by giving the latter uncontrolled freedom of worship, removing their political disabilities, and, as security for the future, putting or leaving them in possession of the four important fortified cities of La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charité. The star of the Huguenots was again in the ascendant. Coligny, who had been degraded from his high office of Admiral and outlawed by the Parliament of Paris in 1569, was received into favour, invited to Court, and even admitted into the King's counsels. The effect of his newly acquired influence was soon apparent in the espousal by the King of the Protestant side in European politics, in the betrothal of his sister Margaret to the young Huguenot King of Navarre; in the secret treaty entered into with England for religious no less than for political purposes, and, above all, in the underhand support extended to the Protestant rebels in the Low Countries. Emboldened by the success of his schemes Coligny at last took the step which led ultimately to his own assassination and the massacre which followed it, when on the defeat of the Huguenot de Genlis by the Duke of Alva at Mons (June 11, 1572), he strove to push the King into an open rupture with Spain by a formal declaration of war. For the eyes of the Queen-mother were, by this time open to the alarming fact, that the influence she had exercised over her son from his cradle was passing to another, and with it her control of State affairs. It was no longer her will or her son's, but the imperious will of Coligny that dictated the foreign and domestic policy of France. She was wounded at once in her maternal instincts, which were strong, and in her ruling passion, love of power, which was stronger still. Of open hostilities with Spain she would not hear until secure of the support of England, and that was more than problematical. But if the war was to be prevented, something must be done, and done quickly. At the meeting with her son in the famous Council of Montpipeau (August 10, 1572) she plied him on her knees with tears, threats, and entreaties, not altogether without effect. The King promised obedience, but, weak and irresolute as usual, soon fell again under the domination of Coligny.

In Catherine's mind the hour was come to strike a blow which should be decisive of her ascendancy. To that ascendancy



Coligny was the principal obstacle. It seems clear that the Queen's abandonment of her policy of conciliation dates from the interview at Montpipeau, and as little doubtful that she formed there and then her project for the assassination of Coligny. Coligny killed, the King would be once again manageable. The Huguenots would probably fly to arms to avenge his death, a little blood-letting, and the catastrophe might be explained to the world as the final act in the civil war. Accordingly, in the morning of August 22nd, Coligny was fired upon by a hired assassin as he was returning from a visit to the King. The wounds inflicted, though serious, were not mortal. The first blow had failed ; it must now be repeated, if only in self-defence. Terrified by her consciousness of guilt and the defiant attitude of the Huguenots clamouring for vengeance, Catherine threw shame and irresolution to the winds.<sup>1</sup> In a secret council held at the palace and composed of the King, Anjou, Guise, and others, she at last overcame the scruples of her son and persuaded him to anticipate the bloody and traitorous designs, attributed to the friends of the Admiral, in the massacre that followed.<sup>2</sup> Coligny was the first to perish at the hands of a party headed by the Duke of Guise in circumstances of peculiar horror and indignity. Then at the loud sound of the tocsin, the preconcerted signal, the people of Paris, already for days excited to fever-point by the presence and arrogant bearing of the hated Huguenots in their midst,<sup>3</sup> were let loose to work their wicked will, and, their passions inflamed by the memory of a thousand wrongs, they fell to the work of slaughter in house and street and lane with a frenzy of rage and a thirst for blood not to be satiated till the very gutters ran and the river was red with it.

The bloody drama enacted in the streets of Paris was played over again, as we have already seen, in the towns and cities of the provinces, principally in those which had suffered the most cruelly in times past at the hands of the Huguenots ; with this difference, however, that whereas in the capital the

<sup>1</sup> Salviati to Cardinal of Como, September 2nd and 22nd, apud Theiner, *Annales*, vol. i. Mant. Doc. p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> Lingard, *Hist. of England*, viii. ii. p. 96 ; Theiner, *Annales*, vol. i. pp. 328, seq.

<sup>3</sup> Previous Edicts of Pacification had expressly stipulated, that the King's "good city of Paris" was never to be offended by the presence of the obnoxious Huguenot. The leaders of the party with hundreds of their followers had flocked into Paris on this occasion for the celebration of the marriage of Henry of Navarre with Margaret of Valois.

murders were sanctioned by authority, in the provinces they were generally the effect of popular passion, which the civil governors had not always the power, when they had the will, to control.<sup>1</sup> As to the total number of the slain, it is quite impossible to form an accurate opinion, since the statements of historians on this head are very conflicting, and fluctuate between the two extremes of 1,000 and 100,000. Mr. Froude,<sup>2</sup> whilst giving in the text the latter figure as the number of persons believed at the time to have perished, has the fairness to add, in a foot-note, that in all large numbers, when unsupported by exact statistics, it is safe to divide at least by ten. Even so, ten thousand is probably a gross exaggeration, since with all the pains they may be presumed to have taken to arrive at the correct number, the Calvinists failed to identify by name more than about eight hundred victims for insertion in the pages of their Martyrology.<sup>3</sup>

This in substance is the story of the massacre. It is difficult to understand how writers who allow Catherine to have been one of the shrewdest political heads of her time, can in the same breath contend that the massacre was a plot deeply laid and long premeditated; for surely never was crime of such magnitude, the results of which were to be so far-reaching and so lasting, more clumsily executed. Not only did the contrivers of the alleged plot take no means to secure success, they on the contrary did all in their power to ensure failure. They seem even to have gone out of their way to give the Huguenots timely warning of the storm that was brewing. Instead of so arranging matters that the massacre should take place simultaneously on the same day all over the kingdom, as Assuerus of old had ordered the slaughter of the Jewish people, we are told that the first orders of the King for its execution were issued on the 28th of August, four days after St. Bartholomew's day, a delay which would allow plenty of time for the news of the massacre at Paris to precede the King's despatches and give the alarm to the threatened Huguenots. In fact, the murders in the provinces were the work not of a single day, but of whole weeks, the frenzy of killing spreading from town to town like the ravages of the influenza or the cholera in

<sup>1</sup> Lingard, loc. cit. *Revue des Quest. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 330—348.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of England*, vol. x. c. xxiii. p. 408.

<sup>3</sup> *Martyrologe des Calvinistes*, printed in 1582, and quoted by M. Ch. Barthélemy, *Mensonges Historiques*, 1ère série, p. 220.



our own time.<sup>1</sup> Again, what surer way to defeat the plan by alarming the enemy and putting him on his guard, than the attempt on Coligny's life two days before the general massacre? What could the astute Catherine have been dreaming about to jeopardize the entire enterprise, for the sake of anticipating the death of her enemy by two short days? In the hypothesis, then, of a premeditated plot, the measures for its successful execution were from first to last so ill-taken that the massacre was not only not the final act in the war, but on the contrary the signal for a fresh outbreak of civil strife a few weeks later. With a fatality, therefore, which so often waits on wickedness, the crime was a useless and a barren crime. The Catholics were eventually the losers and their victims the only gainers by it, since it has affixed an indelible stigma to the Catholic name, and by the feelings of pity it has evoked in men's minds for the sufferings of the Huguenots, has helped the world to forget, if not to condone, the misdeeds which brought down at last so terrible a retribution on their heads.<sup>2</sup>

But there remains still to be considered the most serious charge of all, the alleged complicity of the Holy See in the massacre.

"What judgment," asked the *Times* not longer ago than September 5, 1892, "are we to form about the Pope who gave his approval to the St. Bartholomew Massacre, and who is now ranked among the canonized saints of his Church?" Is this really the voice of our leading journal, or is it only a familiar echo from Exeter Hall? What judgment are we to form? Why, what judgment can any reasonable being form

<sup>1</sup> The massacres took place at Meaux, August 25; at La Charité, August 27; at Saumur and Angers, August 29; at Lyons, August 30; at Troyes, September 2; at Bourges, September 15; at Rouen, September 17; at Romans, September 20; at Toulouse, September 23; at Bordeaux, October 3; at Poitiers, October 27.

<sup>2</sup> A Nemesis seems to have dogged the steps of the chief actors in the massacre. Charles IX. never held up his head after it, and died two years later. The Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III., was assassinated, while still under the ban of excommunication for his murder of the Cardinal of Guise, by Jacques Clément, in 1589. The Duke of Guise was savagely murdered when as head of the Ligue he was playing in Paris the traitorous part formerly played by Coligny as chief of the Huguenot faction. Coligny was done to death by order of Charles IX.; Guise by that of Henry III. Guise spurned the corpse of Coligny with his foot; Henry III. kicked that of Guise in the face. Catherine de' Medici died neglected in January, 1589. "Elle n'eut pas plus tôt rendu le dernier soupir, qu'on n'en fit pas plus de compte que d'une chèvre morte." (*L'Estoile*. Cf. Chateaubriand, *Études ou Discours Historiques*, vol. iv. pp. 297, seq.)

save only this, that so surely as Pius V. is a canonized Saint of his Church—for the poisoned shaft is aimed at him—so surely did he never, no, never, give his approval to the St. Bartholomew Massacre. A man may not believe in the saints, nor in the invocation of the saints, but if he is a man with a grain of sense, he must admit that there is not on God's earth a more irrefragable testimony to character than that which is furnished by canonization. Hatred of Catholicism to be effective should be seasoned with just a spice of sense, and what man of sense, let him hate the Church with ever so "perfect a hatred," will go the length of affirming that she canonizes the accomplices of murder? Yes, Pius V., in whose elevation to the Chair of St. Peter men, such as St. Charles Borromeo and St. Philip Neri, saw a special intervention of Providence, is a canonized Saint, whom the Church of God invokes and holds up to the veneration of her children, and in whose honour she offers to God the great sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. The fact, therefore, though only indirect, is yet absolutely conclusive evidence, that the charge of complicity in the St. Bartholomew Massacre laid at his door by the enemies of Catholicism, is as nonsensical as it is blasphemous.

But this is by no means all. Two things at the outset are perfectly plain: first, that if the Pope had any hand in this most atrocious crime, his complicity must be that of the accessory before the fact, for Pius had been in Heaven nearly four months when the massacre took place; and secondly, that if he gave his approval to it, he must have had some previous knowledge of it, since not even an infallible Pope can sanction that of which he has no knowledge. But what knowledge could Pius have had of a crime, which the very perpetrators, as we have seen and is now generally admitted, had not even imagined till a very few days, a couple of weeks at the most, before its actual commission? An attempt to solve the problem for us has been lately made by Canon Jenkins, who in a letter printed in the *Times* of September 2, 1892, lays it down peremptorily that "the urgent letters of this sanguinary Pope to the King and Queen of France led on to the Massacre of St. Bartholomew." Here at any rate we have a distinct and definite charge. It was the letters of St. Pius V. which wrought the mischief.

Now in the matter of these letters we must be careful to keep closely to the high-road, the point in debate, and not allow ourselves to be led off into the by-lanes of side issues.

The question is, therefore, not whether these "urgent" letters were urgent for a policy of greater or less severity against the Huguenots, but whether they were urgent with an intent or an utter recklessness of the consequences of his words, which lays their writer open to the serious charge of complicity in one of the most atrocious deeds of treachery and murder on record.

The policy advocated by St. Pius towards the Huguenots, as revealed in his correspondence with Charles IX. and the Queen-mother,<sup>1</sup> is undoubtedly a policy of stern but just, and it may be added, necessary severity. The world in these days may disapprove of the policy and condemn it as unwise. All that, as we have said, is beside the present question, which is whether a man may not urge another to adopt for self-preservation measures of severity against his assailants without laying himself open to the charge of inciting to deeds of lawless violence. Now the Pope's policy was the very opposite of the policy pursued by Charles and his mother, which had done so much to aggravate the religious troubles of France by constantly allowing the Huguenots to play fast and loose with their engagements, when a little determination would have put an end once for all to their career of slaughter, sacrilege, and devastation. Pius, therefore, on his accession to the Pontifical throne, in 1566, lost no time in urging the young King of France to take effectual measures for the suppression of these obstinately rebellious heretics. His sentence is for an open, vigorous, uncompromising prosecution of the war until all rebellion is completely trampled out. The Pope is moreover perfectly frank and above-board, speaking his mind, not as conspirators and evil counsellors do, in secret corners or under his breath, and with his hand to his mouth, but straightforwardly by public formal Brief, for all the world to see and read and understand. He even sent money and a little army to the help of the King, which covered itself with glory on the fields of Jarnac and Moncontour. Protestants remember only that the Huguenots were heretics; in the eyes of Pius they were rebels also—the two epithets are constantly coupled together in his letters—brigands by land and pirates on sea, restless, insatiable, implacable, and with men such as these he urges the King, again

<sup>1</sup> *Apostolicarum Pii Quinti, Pont. Max. Epistolarum Libri Quingue*, &c. Editi operâ et curâ Francisci Goutan. Antwerpiae, 1640.

and again, to wage war to the knife, never to come to terms, never to give them any peace until the rebellion has been crushed out of the land. He goes further, he threatens the King with the judgments of God for neglect of his duty to the Church and his own subjects by his criminal tolerance of rebellious heretics, even to the loss of his crown if, like Saul sparing the Amalekites, he spares those who spare neither God nor man. Language strong as this, it may be urged, is a direct incitement to a war of extermination. If so, it is at any rate war, not massacre nor murder, war carried on by soldiers lawfully enrolled and fighting according to the laws of civilized warfare, not waged by cut-throats and assassins, which the Pope is advocating for the extermination of a most savage and relentless rebellion.

But, it may be further argued, that not in the course of the war alone, but even when the heat of battle is passed and the blood has cooled down again, is the King exhorted to show himself merciless to his rebellious subjects. Well, but is mercy to the guilty never an injustice to the innocent? And how, pray, had the Huguenots profited by former leniency if not to commit fresh offences? If unbelief or heresy culminates in persistent overt treason it finds no mercy under any Government worthy of the name, and it must be remembered that whenever the Pope urges the punishment of persistently rebellious and obdurate heretics, even to the infliction of the death penalty, which may be implied but is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the letters, he has always the legal forms of justice in his mind, often on his lips in such expressions as *justis pœnis, justisque suppliciis quæ legibus statuta sunt; adjuvare ut justitiæ et legibus locus sit.* (April 13 and 26, 1569.) The law which punishes treason with death is to be found on the records of all civilized nations and in extreme cases, such as this of which the Pope is speaking, there is often no alternative but to remove the traitor from the body politic, as you remove a cancer by the knife, mawkish sentimentality notwithstanding. If it be argued, as Canon Jenkins' letter seems to argue, that letters so "urgent," and they are very urgent, could only result in murder and massacre, I answer that it would be as reasonable to argue, that because the English law visits murder with the death penalty, the press may not, in given circumstances and for good reasons, urge the Executive to a rigorous enforcement of the law without incurring the guilt of inciting the community to inflict lynch-law on reputed murderers.

The enemies of Pius have even gone the length of asserting that he forbade the giving of quarter, and ordered all rebels taken in battle to be killed out of hand. The assertion is unsupported by a tittle of evidence. But even if true, is the slaying of rebels taken in arms never anything but unjust and unlawful slaying, that is, murder? Is such a summary and severe measure never justifiable homicide? Was it murder in the suppression of the Commune to shoot down men caught *in flagranti*, with the stain of powder on their hands and the mark of the kick of the rifle on their shoulders? And, oh, how tender our conscience when we fancy we have caught a Pope tripping, how little squeamish about our own hard dealings with rebels! Why, the cry for vengeance on the rebel Sepoys still shrills through the air, though it is now more than thirty years since it went up from the Protestant press and pulpits of England. "No nation," wrote the *Saturday Review*,<sup>1</sup> "was ever so irresistibly called to vengeance, and the call will be readily answered." "The mercy which Alva showed in the Netherlands must be all that we know for the present."<sup>2</sup> "It is one consolation, after all we have suffered, that Englishmen now know a little too much about their 'Hindoo fellow-subjects' to be spoony about them. When the country is resettled, the measures adopted will not be tinged with any misbegotten sentimentality."<sup>3</sup>

Quotations of this grim kind might be multiplied almost indefinitely. But enough. Is there not, perhaps, after all some little mistake about this hideous charge brought against the Holy See of complicity in political murder? Has it really been left at the right door? Ought it not to have been taken over the way? Has the Canon who bears so heavily on St. Pius V., never heard of a certain address in which the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Establishment were very "urgent" with the "sanguinary" Head of their Church in September of this very year 1572, for the death of Mary Stuart? How "urgent" they were will appear from the following abridgment of their arguments as given by Mr. Froude<sup>4</sup> from a MS. endorsed in the hand of Burghley, arguments which, we are told, are mainly theological. "Magistrates," they said, "are instituted by God for the suppression of wickednesses; Mary Stuart was wicked, and the Queen would therefore offend in

<sup>1</sup> January 2, 1858.<sup>2</sup> July 25, 1857.<sup>3</sup> September 5, 1857.<sup>4</sup> *History of England*, vol. x. c. xxii. pp. 360, 361.

conscience if she did not punish her. Whether the late Queen of Scots was Queen or subject, stranger or citizen, kin or not kin, by God's word she deserved to suffer, and that in the highest degree. Saul spared Agag, because he was a king, and for that fault God took the kingdom from Saul. . . . Those who seduced the people of God into idolatry were to be slain: there was an express order that no pity should be shown them. . . . If Mary was allowed to escape, God's wrath would surely light on the prince who spared her. . . . To show pity to an enemy, a stranger, a professed enemy of Christ, convicted of so many heinous crimes . . . might justly be termed *crudelis misericordia*." "So spoke," concludes Mr. Froude, "the English Bishops, conveying, in the language of the day, the conviction of the soundest understandings." To more homely minds "the conviction of the soundest understandings" will convey only fresh confirmation of the old familiar adage about the unwisdom of over-indulgence in the luxury of stone-throwing if you have the misfortune to live in a glass house. For either they were right or they were wrong, these Most Reverend Fathers in God. If they were right, how is Pius wrong? If they were wrong, then, at the worst, the "urgent" letters of the "sanguinary" Pope, who called for the punishment of armed heresy and treason, will compare not unfavourably with the truculence of men clamouring for the blood of a defenceless woman at the cruel hands of her unscrupulous cousin.

Well anyhow, it will perhaps be argued by our opponents, if Pius V. is acquitted, there is no denying the complicity of Gregory XIII. in the massacre. He at any rate is an accomplice after, if Pius is not an accessory before, the fact.

"Whether in matter of fact Gregory XIII. had a share in the guilt of the St. Bartholomew Massacre must be proved to me," wrote Cardinal Newman to the *Tablet* just twenty years ago; "before I believe it. It is commonly said in his defence that he had an untrue, one-sided account of the matter presented to him, and acted on misinformation. This involves a question of fact, which historians must decide. But even if they decide against the Pope, his infallibility is in no respect compromised. Infallibility is not impeccability. Even Caiaphas prophesied, and Gregory was not quite a Caiaphas."

Gregory was certainly no Caiaphas, and though not a canonized Saint, he lived the life and died the death of a holy Pope. The man who reformed the calendar and gave his



name to it, was in the eyes of his contemporaries—this is the unanimous testimony of historians—a character of singular sweetness and gentleness, the very last man in the world to dream of, or rejoice in, deeds of treachery and bloodshed. But good or bad, his complicity in the massacre must be proved, not simply asserted, for when Catholics murder or massacre it is not a matter of course that the Pope is a consenting party. It is, as the Cardinal says, a question of fact and of proof. Now infallibility is not omniscience any more than it is impeccability. However deeply Catholics revere the Vicar of Christ, they do not, as Protestants sometimes accuse them of doing, invest the Pope with the attributes of the Almighty, "knowing all things, even our most secret thoughts." His vision is limited like yours and mine, gentle reader; even he cannot see through a stone wall. The defence of Gregory commonly offered is the true defence. There is no proof, and never was any proof, that the Pope knew of an intended massacre; but there is proof in abundance that, after the event, its true character was studiously concealed from him by those who contrived and wrought it. The Cardinal of Como's letter, dated September 8th, asking for further information about the origin of the massacre, its authors, the manner of its execution, and its probable effects, as well as the despatches of the Nuncio in reply, prove conclusively that neither Pope nor Nuncio were in the plot nor in any way accessories to the deed.<sup>1</sup> Even if it be conceded that certain mysterious hints dropped in his presence at Court had given Salviati an inkling of coming treachery, it is at any rate plain from these letters that he had kept his suspicions dark, and that the event took him, no less than the Curia, completely by surprise. Davila, a strong partisan of Catherine's, expressly states that the design was concealed from the Nuncio; the continuator of Mackintosh says that the Nuncio was not in the confidence of those who contrived the plot; even Sismondi is of the same opinion. Indeed Salviati, in informing the Pope of the massacre, states that when, after their first attempt, the murderers discovered that Coligny was not dead, they "determined to throw all shame aside,"<sup>2</sup> words which do not read as if either he or the Pope, to whom he was writing, had any part in their acts.

<sup>1</sup> Theiner, l.c. pp. 331, 332.

<sup>2</sup> Salviati to Como, Sept. 22, apud Theiner, l.c. pp. 331, 332.



Yes, the Pope *was* given a one-sided account of the matter and *did* act on misinformation. Charles IX. and his mother took very good care that he should be so misled and misinformed, a deception very much more easily accomplished in those days, than in these of telegraphs and "our own" correspondents. The King particularly requested Salviati to keep back his despatch, until his own letter to the Pope should be ready, "as he desired that his Ambassador should be the first to give his news to the Pope."<sup>1</sup> Salviati's letter, though dated on the 24th, only left Paris on the 26th of August, after the King had made his statement to Parliament. That statement was a declaration, made by Charles in presence of the Court and to a full House, to the effect that having, by God's mercy, discovered a nefarious plot to murder himself and all the royal family, to upset the monarchy and destroy the Church, he had inflicted prompt and well-merited punishment on the conspirators. This is the version, which studiously concealing the true character of the massacre and representing it as a necessary measure of self-preservation was embodied in the official despatches and sent off to Rome and all the Courts of Europe. The Sieur de Beauville, Charles' special envoy to the Pope, was moreover instructed to support the tenor of his despatches with such verbal explanations as might help still further to remove from the Pontiff's mind any suspicion of treachery or illegality.<sup>2</sup>

Philip of Spain and Queen Elizabeth both believed in the reality of the conspiracy. Philip saw in the execution of the Admiral and his followers the fulfilment of his own advice to Charles to deal vigorously with the Huguenots, until the truth was made known to him, when he condemned the massacre as savouring rather of Turkish savagery than Christian justice.<sup>3</sup> Elizabeth long believed in the truth of the official story, or at any rate acted as if she believed in it,<sup>4</sup> for more than two months after the massacre she told La Motte Fénelon, Charles'

<sup>1</sup> Despatch of Salviati, August 24, apud Theiner, *Annales*, i. p. 329.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Theiner, l.c. cap. xliii.; also p. 336. See Letter of Louis de Bourbon (Montpensier), dated August 26, in which he tells the Pope, that Coligny had been detected in a conspiracy to kill the King and all the royal family for the purpose of setting up a king of his own religion and establishing Protestantism in France.

<sup>3</sup> Brantôme, *Vie de l'Amiral de Châtillon*, tom. viii.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Theiner, l.c. cap. xlvii. He says: "Ipsa Anglorum regina Elizabetha omni in hæreticos studio effusa de eorum conjuratione satis diu non dubitavit." He refers the reader to the *Recueil des dépêches, rapports, instructions, et mémoires des Ambassadeurs de France en Angleterre*, tom. 5, pp. 120, 138, 161, seq. Paris, 1840.

Ambassador, when acceding to that monarch's request to stand sponsor to his daughter, born at the end of October, that "as for the condemnation of the admiral and the others, if their ruin were for the safety of the King of France, no one would be more glad than herself that they were dead."<sup>1</sup>

If Philip and Elizabeth, if the people and Parliament of Paris were hoodwinked, why should not the Pope have been deceived as well? What was there to make the story improbable? Was it not, on the contrary, to the last degree probable? For many years—ever since the death of Henry II.—to get possession of the King's person, to separate him from his Italian mother and keep him in their possession, if only as a hostage and security for their own safety, had been a favourite scheme of Condé and the Admiral. The conspiracy of Amboise had been followed once, if not twice, by similar projects. Familiar for years past with all this, the Pope hears of an event which is described to him as a stand-up fight between armed men, not as a treacherous and cold-blooded massacre; of a just punishment which he has reason to believe was lawfully inflicted on rebels and conspirators taken red-handed; of a deliverance which saved the life of the King, gave peace to France, and freed the Church from the ravages of an irreconcilable enemy—and all this on evidence, which, with the well-known antecedents of that enemy, it was the most natural thing in the world to accept as trustworthy. Three full months after the massacre it was still thought and spoken of in Rome as the repression of a murderous conspiracy, witness Muret's pompous harangue before the Pope and Cardinals, and in presence of the new envoy, sent by Charles to congratulate the Pontiff on his accession, and to remove from his mind any doubts it might still retain about the massacre.<sup>2</sup>

This, then, is that for which Catholics rejoiced and thanked God; not a lawless massacre, but the defeat of a Huguenot conspiracy, the deliverance of France from a relentless enemy, the triumph of right over wrong. It was natural that they should rejoice over an event which brought peace and safety to their side. Men just saved from an impending calamity do not stop to ask questions about the instruments of their deliverance. At least, they can hardly be expected not to feel and express

<sup>1</sup> *Dépêches de La Motte Fénelon*, vol. v. pp. 205, 206; *ap.* Strickland, *Elizabeth*, p. 283.

<sup>2</sup> Theiner, l.c. cap. xlvi. and pp. 336, 337.

joy for their safety. The Pope published a Jubilee, that is to say, he ordered a solemn thanksgiving to God for what he had been led to consider "a providential and almost miraculous escape" of the King of France from the "knavish tricks" of rebellious heretics, quite as legitimate a subject for congratulation, surely, as the mercy which our Anglican friends still commemorate, I believe, in their thanksgiving services for "the happy deliverance of King James I. and the Three Estates of England from the most traitorous and bloody-intended massacre by gunpowder."<sup>1</sup>

There were, accordingly, processions, a *Te Deum*, illuminations, salvoes of artillery, and all the customary rejoicings on such occasions. The kindness of a friend has supplied me with a cast of the commemorative medal about which Protestants make such a pother. It witnesses as plainly, as anything of the sort can, to the belief of him who struck it in the story of an armed conspiracy put down by force of arms. It is the size of a two-shilling piece, and bears on the obverse the effigy of Gregory XIII., whilst on the reverse, under the legend *Vgonottorum Strages*, stands the figure of the Destroying Angel, a cross in his left and a drawn sword in his right hand, in the act of defeating an armed band of six or seven Huguenots. Three of these are lying dead, another, perhaps intended for Coligny himself, equipped with helmet, breast-plate, and buckler, and holding in his right hand an uplifted, but broken sword, is on the point of falling; the rest, one of them apparently a woman, are running away in terror. The ground is strewn, as it would be after a fight, with buckler, sword, mace, and halberd. So much for the medal. Vasari's painting of the St. Bartholomew bears the same witness. Those who are familiar with it describe it as the picture not of a massacre but of a stand-up fight or battle. When, it may be asked, did the paintings of the Vatican or the medals of the Pontifical museum begin to rank as Papal pronouncements? Artists are kittle cattle. When Paul III. took exception to the nudity of some of the figures in Michael Angelo's frescoes, the latter sent His Holiness word to trouble himself more about the reformation of men than the amendment of pictures. Vasari was at this time engaged upon the decoration of the Sala Regia in the Vatican Palace with frescoes descriptive of the Battle of Lepanto. He found an appropriate place in the same hall for a representation

<sup>1</sup> Book of Common Prayer, 1824.

in three tableaux of the destruction of the Huguenots, a name which for years had been as full of menace and terror to Christendom as that of the abominable Turk himself. Surely, then, not love of truth, but only hatred of the Papacy can account for the persistency with which, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, his indiscriminating assailants charge Gregory with approving the massacre, not as it had been told to him, but as history has revealed it to us with all its attendant horrors and the black lie which hid its guilt away, under a cloak of seeming legality, from the eyes of an amazed and horrified world.

But it is time to end. Whoever were the guilty contrivers of the massacre, whether the plot was of short or long pre-meditation, this much is certain, that the massacre was a purely political *coup d'état* by which, in the forcible language of Joseph de Maistre, "Quelques scélérats firent périr quelques scélérats," and that Catholics, as such, and the Holy See, in particular, are free from the least complicity in its guilt. If St. Pius V. was "urgent" for the extermination of rebellious heretics, his urgency was the same in kind as that which had preached the crusade against the Turk and had defeated him at Lepanto, a triumph in which, alas, Catholic France had no hand, she being in that hour (1571) unfortunately for her glory and her best interests, under the dominating influence of the Admiral of Châtillon. If Gregory XIII. was glad and gave thanks to God for the destruction of the Huguenots, this, we know, was because he had received a version of the tragedy which led him to believe, as it led others to believe, that they were only anticipated in their treacherous designs for the overthrow of the French monarchy by timely measures of a regrettable but necessary severity. And so I take leave of the controversy, content if this small contribution to it has succeeded in throwing some little light into the dark corners of a mystery which calumny has done so much to deepen, and which will probably continue to be, in the future as in the past, better known than understood down to the Great Day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

WILLIAM LOUGHNAN

## *The Zambesi Mission.*

---

### II.

THE great opportunities afforded by the British South African Company, of which we spoke in our last number, can only be adequately appreciated by contrasting them with the surroundings of the early years of Zambesi work. The patient, persevering abnegation and heroic energy of Catholic missionaries can only be understood by the details of their enterprise, whether carried on amid the terrible difficulties of the past or amid the more favourable, but scarcely less trying, circumstances of the present. In our last article, after a slight retrospect of the years of trial from '79, and after sketching the marvellous rise of the British South African Company, we mentioned how Fathers of the Society and Dominican Sisters accompanied the pioneer force which penetrated Mashonaland. We also gave some idea of the work of the nuns in the hospital service of that country, and recorded the grateful recognition which their untiring devotion and abnegation had met with on all sides. We were able to introduce our readers into the midst of the work now going on, by means of extracts from Father Schomberg Kerr's letters and diaries—and having left him and his companions engaged in the conversion of a dying Kaffir, we will now accompany him on his journey to the interior.

They were then making for the mission of Kalkfontein, Vleeshfontein, or Tseni-Tseni, for such are its various names, in the Transvaal, situated ten miles from the frontier of British Bechuanaland. This mission, which is at a height of some 4,600 feet above the sea, is surrounded with peach, fig, and apricot-trees, besides tropical vegetation. It overlooks a fertile and sheltered valley, and is well provided with springs. Excellent corn is grown, and European garden produce of all kinds thrives well. The mission was started in the end of 1884 by Father Croonenberghs and Father Temming. It had the advantage from the first of being under a settled Government, and it has always prospered. The natives are an offshoot of the Batlagin

or Fish tribe, the great bulk of whom dwell much further south, in the vicinity of the Hart River and the tributaries of the Malopo. They are Bechuanas, as likewise are the tribes among whom our particular offshoot has settled. The situation is one of great importance, not only from its natural advantages of climate and fertility, but being close to the main lines of communication between the Colony and Zambesi, it forms a link between them. In the year of its foundation Father Croonenberghs wrote of a touching incident which befell him, as he was travelling towards the future mission. One evening when, after a frightful storm, he was standing by the out-spanned wagon, in lonely desert country, he suddenly saw a small knot of men and women nearing him in the plain. It was a funeral procession. The body was carried on a stretcher, with a white cloth wrapped round the head. A grave had been prepared—it was presently lined with skins and the clothes of the dead man arranged as a pillow. He was then laid on the left side, his face towards the north, and carefully covered with his blanket. Over this again were laid pieces of zinc and tin, remains of old cases. The whole was covered with earth. The mother, wives, and daughters of the deceased then sprinkled him with earth while they said some words. There was so much simple gravity, reverence, and sorrow about them, that the Father was deeply moved. Some conversation then took place among them, and he thought they wanted, as is usual enough, some tobacco before beginning their lamentations. Instead of this, however, the mother asked him to pray over her son. "Who are you?" asked the missionary. "We are Batlagins of the further north," answered they. Some of the very tribe whom he was going to evangelize! He prayed for them as they wished, and spoke of the mercy of God and the leading truths of religion. They listened with great attention and then sobs and lamentations filled the air. After praying again for them he left them. His only companion, the driver of the wagon, had been much impressed by the scene, and soon after promised him he would become a Christian. The tribe responded well to the efforts of the missionaries. They held back for a time, as the land acquired by the latter for the mission had changed owners so often they hardly would believe any one could mean to stay among them. Two native villages, one of about three hundred and the other of one hundred inhabitants, were close by, and, when once the first feeling had subsided, the chiefs willingly gave leave to their people to frequent the schools,



and one of them became himself a fervent Christian. At Vleeshfontein, accordingly, nearly eight years after the above events, Father Kerr and party are arriving. He writes about the fertile though stony valley, and continues: "By dusk we were on our own land, but as another hour's journey lay before us, to spare Father Temming having to provide supper for so many unexpected visitors, we stopped and took our evening meal.

"It was nine o'clock before we reached the gate of the pomegranate avenue which leads from the Fontein outspan to the mission house and church. We were warmly welcomed by the good Padre. Never before had the hospitable walls which greet nearly every passer-by, been so well filled. He had not seen a priest for eight months. We were quickly at home, and as busy as bees, one drawing a plan of the place, another repairing clocks, another making good defects, others sail-making, carpentering, smithing, &c. All were delighted. On Sunday, feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph, the church was crowded, most of a congregation of ninety souls being present. The village contains two hundred, some, thank God, always *in via*. Father Temming is very careful and methodical in his way of treating them, and seems most particular to educate them in the great reverence for the Blessed Sacrament and for everybody and everything connected with God's house. It is interesting and instructive to notice the different methods pursued in giving Christian civilization to the Kaffir in the various Catholic missions. They differ almost as widely as the missions are far apart. Our three have little in common beyond essentials. The Oblates also vary among themselves. The Trappists have a system of their own. Many consider the method they pursue in Natal to be the true one.

"As far as possible they absorb the Kaffirs into their own life, in the schools for children, and homes for apprentices and unmarried adults, the males living with the monks, and the females with the Sisters. The natives have the same food, often better than their own. They work side by side with the Brothers, and follow their practices of piety, every quarter of an hour reciting a little prayer. They sleep on bedsteads and eat at tables, and when marriage comes, square partitioned houses are insisted on, and sufficient furniture. In this way family units gradually grow up around their stations with Christian manners, and in time will produce a Christian society. One of their great points is that they ennoble work—*Labora et ora*. The Trappist Rule singularly lends itself to



such a system, and few could compete with them, but their principle and treatment of the natives might be carried out by others in their best points, and I have no doubt similar results attained. As yet, however, though I have formed no definite opinion, I confess the spirit and practice here on almost opposite lines seems good. So much depends on the character of priest, place, and people." Father Daignault says: "Our plan in the Colony and here at Kalkfontein has been generally to induce native families to settle on the properties we buy for the purpose, dividing them into plots which each family cultivates as they like best. It is assumed the natives will come to the church, and the children frequent our schools. Nobody is, however, obliged to do so, nor is any one forced to become a Catholic, though as a rule the close intercourse which necessarily must take place leads to this happy result. In their homes and in their daily life the natives enjoy full liberty, and are bound by no other rules than those to which all Catholics have to submit. As far as we can judge, this system, if it could be carried out on a larger scale, would bear a very close resemblance to that which was put into force in the famous Reductions of the Society before its suppression. The chief difficulties here are the large proportion of heathens, but this gradually diminishes, and secondly the Kaffir 'beer question,' which I suppose must always exist." "Towards sundown," continues Father Kerr, "we had evening service and Benediction. All the day Father Temming had two additional guests, officers of the British Bechuana Police, who had come over from Gabrones (twenty-seven miles) to spend a quiet day; both Protestants. They arrived in the heaviest of thunder-storms, and were a little astonished to find themselves in a nest of Jesuits. However, we absorbed them into our family life to the best of our power, and I think they rather enjoyed themselves. This little mission is a resource, I find, for all Bechuana-land. It is widely known, and members of the Police Force often come over. Our guests rode off on Monday morning."

Father Kerr and party soon proposed to start again, but the lost luggage, which comprised plant for the various intended establishments, and the state of the oxen, caused difficulties. As to the former, no man of any South African experience, where the unexpected always happens, could possibly predict when it might appear. The depredations among the cattle by lung disease, we have already noticed; eighteen had died and many others were unfit for work. They had bought six more, the

smallest possible number with which to replace their losses when to their consternation, thirty-six hours afterwards, one was reported to have lung-sickness. Father Kerr writes: "The road was as safe for the oxen as the kraal, so we determined to trust to the Sacred Heart, and move on. Father Temming tried to supply every possible want, and killed a fatted calf, which as biltong carried us far." On the feast of St. Francis Jerome, May 11, they started, and a new wagon acquired at Kalkfontein was christened the "Jerome." One more ox sickened, but otherwise the spans gradually improved. A characteristic incident occurred before they left. Thirty shillings per month and food were the handsome terms arranged by Father Temming with the Kaffir "boys," and gladly accepted by them. "Some few hours before starting I saw them," says Father Kerr, "in close and gloomy consultation with the same good Father. By some abstruse calculation they had found it meant one shilling per day, at which they became terribly down, and refused to stir under eighteen pence, which I declined to give. This is a good specimen of what the natives do, and they are independent, too, as they all help each other. When they travel a handful of meal is all they need, and the veriest stranger may squat and put his hand into the pot as he passes. Instead of the deserters, however, we got a Christian native lad of whom Father Temming hopes much, twenty years of age, pious and self-sacrificing, who volunteered the moment he heard there was a difficulty; also a Matabele-boy of fifteen returning to his tribe, and who offered to work his way for his food alone. I trust we shall save him from a return to savage life; lastly, Jacob, a herd who wanted a job, and came for £1, and so we decidedly gained by our exchange.

"Our course now lay down the Marico till it joins the Crocodile River, forty-two miles. The former is a rapid stream about the size of the Teviot, but there is no Marico 'dale.' Only rough, broken, though undulating country, through which the river winds its way like an eel some twenty feet below the level. A famous fever region! but this year the rains have been small and early, and the country is already dry. We struck the Limpopo or Crocodile, one of the great rivers of South Africa, and boundary of the Transvaal, which runs a course of seven hundred miles from the junction of the Marico to the sea. Here it is about the size of the Tweed at its best. After forty miles along its banks we sighted the telegraph wires, and found by calculation we had crossed the tropical line, and

so entered the Mission, on Saturday, May 21st, under the patronage of St. Michael. The day was kept with full honours: General Communion, *Te Deum*, and our best fare."

That night the travellers came to the first house in the Mission, the store of Macroon the agent. Many wagons were about, as it is the point of junction for the main lines of travel to Khamatown, Tati, Buluwayo, and Zambesi. There a fresh exchange of oxen was made, as it was the last departure before Macloutsie, one hundred and eighty miles further. The feeble ones were sent back, and with the help of Messrs. Musson, who were very obliging, a cheap bargain was made with Romulala, a Bamangwato from Khamatown, with a good span. The character of the country now changes somewhat. The line of the Crocodile is marked with foliage, and there are fine trees. None of the sacred animals were seen. At Selika Hill, eighteen miles from the river, an outpost of the British Bechuana Police, the missionaries had their largest congregation, fifteen in all. The vegetation here becomes more tropical, the gigantic Baobab and the Hardekoolboom are numerous, the Mopani also appears. The travellers are now in the South African Punjaub, or land of the five rivers, and they make one of these sand-beds day by day, finding water in the hollows. In the rainy season the currents must be strong, as the "drifts" are wide, steep, and heavy. On June the 2nd they reached Macloutsie, and outspanned before Father Nicot and Father Barthelemy, who had arrived ten days previously, found them out.

A large marquee and tents had been prepared for them near the hospital, but for necessary repairs they were more usefully quartered as they were. They found Father Barthelemy well, and the Sisters much the better for the rest they had had within convent walls. The whole party kept the festival of Pentecost, the chapel being in the convent which is attached to the hospital of the station, with doctor's and chaplain's huts hard by. The camp or station is well laid out, and there is a fine and extensive view of Matabeleland from the fort at the top of the rise. Father Kerr writes: "We have been given the use of a farm, and it may prove a helpful half-way house. Unfortunately there are no natives in this neighbourhood. At present Macloutsie is the head-quarters of the British Bechuana Police. I was agreeably surprised with the military spirit and discipline that prevailed. The officers were most kind, and ready to help us in every way. They invited us to

dinner frequently, put horses at our disposal, and made provision for us as best they could. Indeed, one of the pleasantest things was to hear the hearty and sincere way in which they spoke the praises of our Fathers all along the line from Mafeking to Motokos. Nothing could exceed the hospitable plans of Father Nicot and Rev. Mother Jacoba for our party. The Germans, however, though their luggage was still chasing us astern, were all for moving on. Their get-up hardly commended itself to the eye, but it was practical, and with colonial goods, and new boots, they declared themselves independent of further use of creatures.

"This cheerful spirit and union is admirable, nothing causes discouragement or complaint. It is true a special providence has dealt kindly with us. We have had a taste of nearly every kind of difficulty—just enough to make us grateful—but when the worst seemed upon us, we have been happily relieved. Father Barthelemy, too, had his trials—loss of oxen, Sisters sick, and Walter Jordan with a bilious fever. This in addition to the usual troubles from intemperance of the Kaffirs, short commons, and the privation of *lacticinia*, and the rest, but the good Father is a campaigner, not by nature but by grace, and so he throve on difficulties.

"The Sisters sustained their high reputation under no ordinary troubles, and the regularity with which they accomplish the Divine Office in choir and other spiritual duties is very edifying. Indeed wagon life in our experience is helpful. There is more time to pray, and I suppose God rewards the extra effort required. We keep community life as far as possible, modified by exigencies of trek and water. We have settled down to three treks a day, afternoon, evening, and morning. On stopping follow the Masses, &c. The Kaffirs quickly take in the manners of their masters. I have seen them blessing themselves as they stand round the fire before meals. They come to Mass on Sundays and are very attentive, doing all Leo does. It is curious that our Cape Colony Kaffir, Joseph, understands the Matabele boy better than Leo the Bechuana. We are told the various languages do not help each other, but I cannot accept that altogether; the natives from various parts certainly contrive to understand each other. We are reserving ourselves chiefly for the Mashona tongue, of which Father Temming has given us MS. notes."

All the party were sorry to leave bright little Macloutsie. Father Kerr remained behind the rest to make a visitation and

give some spiritual exercises nightly in the chapel to some of the British Bechuana Police. "There are generally some thirty at the station, but unfortunately many were absent at the time on various duties. The men appreciate the Sisters' work, and at Easter they made a collection, each troop making their own offering, the total amounting to over £50. On Trinity Sunday Major Grey, the Commandant, returned and was good enough to call on me. I found him very obliging and ready to carry out what I wished. He is a cousin of one of the Directors of the British South African Company, Albert Grey, and so is interested in Macloutsie, which indeed he has made. I afterwards lunched at the mess, and at dark took the mail-cart to Tuli, being the only passenger. At Lipopo, sixteen miles off, we awaited the down-mail, a two-wheel cart with oxen, which arrived at nine; at this point carts meet and mail-passengers are transferred. The new arrival was glad to see our cart all right, for he remarked, 'For I've capsized twice.' The 'only passenger's' feelings of relief were moderated, however, when his own driver continued: 'I've a bad wheel, but I dare say, as it has kept on so far, it will go through,' which words were remembered as they passed the worst ground they had yet been over, and where any wagon not capsizing is considered lucky! The other remained on the veldt all night till daylight."

At Tuli various matters had to be authoritatively settled. Father Kerr called on the magistrate; a letter from Dr. Harris put him at rest, and Captain Barnett was most civil and anxious to oblige in every way.

"My next business was to arrange for freighting up the Canisius wagon. Romulala had to return from here. I was warned I should have trouble as there were no Kaffirs with cattle, and the Dutch don't care to leave their own wagons behind. It took me part of three days to come to terms with 'Gasper Vassyl' of Zeerust. The first day I would have nothing to do with him—as to paying twenty shillings per hundred pound, I would rather leave the goods at Tuli.

"We tried to persuade Romulala to come on with us, but he had no leave from his chief, and now I know the difficulties of the road, I am glad we did not keep him. Kaffirs and their oxen seem to have no idea of transport work. They are all very well for Tent wagons, but give them a heavy Buck with eight or ten thousand pounds, and they can't get along. There is only one way of making oxen pull who won't, and

Romulala would not do this, and the other spans had to help oftener than should have been. On the third day old Gasper returned, bent, I could see, on doing business, and most anxious to know my highest figure. I said, 'Take up my luggage and the Buck to Fort Salisbury, and then you may keep the latter.' This at first he rather liked, but we ultimately agreed on 15s. per one hundred lbs. for the luggage, and 10s. for ditto for the buck-load, or as they put it, 12s. 6d. all round.

"Two hours later we had inspanned, and the toilsome drag over the Shashi River had begun. It is the widest river-bed, perhaps, in South Africa, some four thousand yards at the drift, of soft sand, into which a walking-stick will sink eighteen inches. Two or three spans are always needed. The Dutchman, however, thought he could do it; but though splendidly trained to work and pull as one, they had to give in. Father Barthelemy and I, who had stayed behind for closing accounts, letters, &c., crossed the stream by moonlight on the back of our Kaffir guide, and then paced the heavy sand on either side, reaching our outspan at 10 p.m. Next morning we had a halt to celebrate Corpus Christi. Father Richartz has a special talent for decoration; as usual he had a pretty altar arranged among some green trees, and Father Boos treated the German nuns and brothers to a German sermon. Next morning we reached Ipazi, with fine trees, and another day's trek brought us to the Umzingwaine River, where we halted for Sunday."

The travellers had now reached the lion country, and camp fires and night watches began. Canisius wagon took the first night, the occupants dividing the watch, but not a sound was heard except an occasional wolf howl. Before we continue the account of the journey, however, we must give our readers the benefit of a touching episode told to us by Father Daignault, and one very characteristic of the dangers of South African travel. There was a young Dutchman employed last year by the British South African Company as hospital orderly, who had often seen the good Sisters at work, and had observed their charity and admired their life of continual self-sacrifice—how they cheerfully worked day and night, readily giving up their tents and huts to accommodate the sick, and even forgetting to take their own food till all had been helped with the best of everything. This sight had not only impressed the young man, Van Riet by name, but had moved his soul to its very depths, and when he heard the Sisters were to "trek" north-



wards, he asked to be allowed to accompany them. "The journey is both long and dangerous," urged he, "with plenty of wild beasts in the forests bordering the roads, and you may meet natives, too, who are more to be feared than animals. If need be, I will help to protect and look after you. Anyhow, I can at least cut wood and fetch water for you. You have done so much for us, it is only fair we should do something in return." Father Prestage, who was in charge, could not resist such entreaties, and young Van Riet joined the party.

When they reached the banks of the Umzingwaine, they found the river could not be forded—the waters were too deep. They could do nothing but have patience. No one could tell for how long. Virtue is chiefly acquired by practice, and people who are anxious to excel in the virtue of patience may safely be advised to make a six months' tour in an ox wagon through some unexplored part of South Africa.

To pass time, Van Riet got leave to stroll into the forest, promising Father Prestage to be prudent as to lions, and to return early to the wagon. The afternoon drew on, and night fell without his having reappeared. Guns were fired, search parties organized, and fires lit to guide him back. The poor Sisters, who were forbidden to leave the wagon, could only kneel and pray. The night, an endless one, full of fear and anxiety, was spent in prayer, but when morning dawned there was still no news of the wanderer. Several days were spent in useless search. All hopes of finding him had to be given up, as he must evidently have fallen a prey to some wild animal. So, with bitter grief and prayers for his soul, the journey was resumed.

Week after week elapsed, but though no news were heard of Van Riet, he was not dead. Forty-three days after leaving the wagon he had been found alive by a party of gold-prospectors. They discovered him in a hollow on a hill-side, a living skeleton, completely naked, and having lost the right use of his senses. They treated him very kindly, gave him food and clothing, and as his bodily strength returned, they had the comfort of seeing him recover the use of his mental faculties. When asked to explain how he had spent those forty-three days in the forest, what his food had been, and how he had escaped the lions, he could not do so. He remembered losing his way in the wood, and for a day or two feeding on the little he had with him, and nothing more. When he had fully recovered, Van Riet inquired

where the Sisters had gone, and undertook a six weeks' journey to place himself again at their service. It would be difficult to describe the joy of the good Sisters when the news of his safety reached them. They themselves had never ceased praying for their lost friend, and had hoped against hope. Now God was rewarding them. On the banks of the Umzingwaine they had spent sleepless nights from anxiety, now joy kept them awake, and the walls of their hut re-echoed their hearty thanksgivings to God. Their joy, however, was not yet complete—Van Riet was still a Protestant. But God had already been so good to him, that they were sure their prayers would be granted. And pray they did right well. Last Easter they had the consolation of being present at the reception into the Catholic Church of their faithful friend and protector, who still continues to help them in their work at Fort Salisbury Hospital.

Father Kerr and companions fortunately were able to cross the river—a heavy sand bed and steep bank. Let us observe *en passant* that a steep bank in South Africa generally means something that we in this country should consider absolutely inaccessible to wheeled vehicles of any sort or kind. Twenty miles further brought them to another river with the same characteristics. "The Dutchman broke his dissel-boom, and spent the night with his party in the river-bed. Next day his leaders ran away, but he cares for none of these things—his imperturbable spirit is delightful. Masses for St. Aloysius were said in the skeleton rooms of a new store-house in course of erection. After Mass, as we prepared to move, we discovered that Father Barthelemy's span of oxen had been lost that morning by the boy Jacob, who had been afraid, however, to tell till mid-day, and the searchers were still out when our wagon inspanned. This might have had serious results among wild beasts and wily natives; moreover, once really frightened, the patient ox will run for miles. It was therefore with some satisfaction I heard their wagons trek past our outspan at two o'clock next morning. In fact they reached the next water, the Moshani River, before we did. Grass is improving and growth of Mopani and other trees also. Thorns are disappearing and leaves enlarging. Kopjes (great granite boulders), some bared, some covered, are raising their heads—it is unmistakably South Africa. Letoutsi, seven miles further on, seems an exceptionally pretty place, but we passed it at night. Now native villages begin to be heard of near the

line of march, and the police have a station here. Next morning we outspanned on the shore of the Bubyana or little Buby, and Brother Meyer had to supply a new dissel-boom to the Jerome wagon. We found the young store-keeper on the hill just recovering from fever. He was full of lion stories: how, early last December, for five nights they alternated between these rivers, killing two oxen from passing outspanned wagons each night. On one occasion they added two horses from the wagon-side, and finally killed a koodoo close to the store which he added to his larder next morning. If a lion means business it is a very short and simple affair I understand. He creeps up in silence, springs on the neck of his victim, with one stroke of the paw rips it open, and then devours the entrails, leaving the rest for the following meal. The noble animal has a special fancy for donkeys, choosing them in preference to everything else. What a lion will dare seems to depend entirely on his appetite. If very hungry he despises camp fires, and will spring into a kraal, seize a man and be off in a moment. Hence old hands seem to make little guard against them, saying, if he means to come he will, do what you will. Of course certain general precautions as far as circumstances allow should be taken; but I find a growing inclination to make a big sign of the Cross, and follow my neighbours.

"An attack is quite the exception, and I believe there is no instance of an ox being taken from a wagon in motion, although they may follow and growl, as they do round kraals often enough, for weeks and months together, hoping to frighten some poor beast out, or provoke a general stampede. As yet we have not had even the growl, though we have seen their 'spoor.' Up to date none of our sportsmen had been successful, and both parties have therefore been constantly short of fresh meat. So we planned a halt and a shoot on the banks of the second 'Buby,' three miles on. Quite an alarming number of guns turned out on the occasion, but after two shots had been fired (with the happy result of a small Daika buck), we were gladdened by the sight of McCabe with his wagon, and the long-lost luggage coming up the drift. There were general rejoicings, and after dinner the luggage was overhauled and found in very good condition, considering the shakings it had gone through. The provisions, too, were in a very good state. Most of it had not been seen since leaving Southampton, and now we were fifteen hundred miles up country.

"McTike's station lay twelve miles further on, and his kraals were dotted about the kopjes. There we should be on the morrow for the feast of the Sacred Heart. A general desire was expressed to keep this first feast with great fervour and as much function as possible. Even Exposition had been spoken of! A trek of six miles and we tied up for the night and lit our camp fires. Next morning, soon after four, we were on the road again. Shortly after I was doubling up behind when I heard a great crack. It was scarcely light, but on advancing a little I saw the 'Jerome' with all the Brothers on board heeling over to port heavily! Another look down into a hole showed me the near hind wheel a complete wreck, every spoke broken! I whistled my alarm and the caravan was brought to a standstill. The situation did not require much consideration, a wheel is the one thing which cannot be made on the road. It was evident that unless we could get one we were done, for the next 'water' was some five or six miles on. Thither the Dutchman went with his wagon. Being then delightfully alone we made our morning duties and celebrated the feast as best we could. After breakfast the two Brothers with jack and screw raised the arm of their after axle, and with a wheel from the 'Loyola' the 'Jerome' was soon on safe ground and the axle chocked. Father Barthelemy then passed on and was able to reach McTike's by noon. McCabe presently returned with an ox sleigh and one of the Dutchman's own wagon wheels. This told its own tale, men like bed at this time. It was of prime importance to get our oxen to water. Just as we were inspanning to vary our troubles in a moment a whole span vanished. Some of McCabe's knew the water and had begun 'to travel,' but they were caught in time. The sun was very hot and the day long, before we rejoined the others near the store and gave the Dutchman his wheel. The store in question we find has been kept by a Scotchman, who had a wagon in his yard, but the loss of a wheel meant the loss of the wagon *pro tem.*, and therefore he had been obdurate all the morning."

Father Kerr determined to try his luck with his countryman, who, slightly refreshed with mountain dew, was eloquent on the depredations of robbers the night before and detailed all his losses. From one pile they had taken six blankets, from another twelve, &c. The Father listened sympathetically and attentively, the damages exceeded £40, and he had already claimed restitution from the chief McTike. Father

Kerr was sorry for the lonesome man. Presently the opportune moment arrived ; he put the important question and was nobly responded to : he might have the wheel, as many wheels as we liked to Manetsi without charge, and after that for a weekly hire. In a few minutes the wheel was on the "Jerome," and "we are still very grateful," wrote the Father some time after.

A little further on they said Mass at the abode of an old Stonyhurst boy, and visited Messrs. Smith, Dillon, and Perkins, all three young men fit for better work. Dillon walked over to our next water, and got laid up with fever. Father Barthelemy stayed behind to nurse him. Then a former St. Aidan's boy overtook them in a mail-cart, very hearty and eager to catch Father Barthelemy and to make his Easter duties. He gave them a handsome present of some game.

The Nuamsie River has a bad reputation for fever, and is rocky and steep. The wagons danced cruelly in crossing. It was such a business they outspanned for the night after two or three miles. Father Barthelemy and party overtook and passed them, and at noonday on the Visitation the rest came up to him and found the Sisters' wagon hard and fast in the middle of the fatal "Lundi." Their two span were exhausted, and Berry thrashed in vain. A third span produced good effects, and at last they moved. Fortunately the river was low, but standing so long in the water caused anxiety for the oxen. All got over with much difficulty, and afterwards the Scotch carts were unloaded to ascertain no damage had been done. They had now entered Mashonaland. They bivouacked for Sunday, and in the afternoon went to inspect an old tower of the Zimbalye type which seem to encircle these parts. Just at dark that same day the cattle bodily all recrossed the river, and could not be found. "Nothing for it but to follow up their spoor at daylight, meanwhile trusting no roaring lion would either devour or frighten them." At the last river Father Barthelemy had to shoot an ox which had had a mouthful taken out of its haunches by a wolf! Wolves of various kind and jackals abound. Ill luck pursued the guns of the party. Before the country was disturbed, game abounded ; but the fact is now more work and skill, together with horses and dogs, are required. Meantime McCabe and Leo heard Mass early, and went out after the cattle, which they feared might be ten miles back, where there was some good grass. The Makalakas are quick in picking up stray cattle and keeping them till a reward is offered !

No small relief was experienced when after late Mass McCabe was reported to be crossing the river with the deserters in charge. There were many graves by the riverside. Yet of those who had lost their lives in crossing, or who had been laid low by fever, only ten could be counted. The store-keeper looked burly and strong, but excused himself by saying he always looked so when recovering from fever. He promised to look after the graves.

After this eventful forty-eight hours, Father Kerr continues: "At sundown we trekked on, not thinking it prudent to linger on the river banks. Next day we went through the Nagua Pass and a pretty but silent country, for it had been raided only last moon by the Matabele. We outspanned across the path they had taken to the doomed villages. One report was of forty-eight men killed, fifty-six women carried off, besides cattle and other *lôot*. I believe the numbers to have been much smaller. Men know their fate, and take to their heels quickly. I examined several empty kraals and gardens on the line, and saw evident signs of a surprise. Not a soul was to be seen, but we could have loaded many a wagon with grain and pumpkins, not worth the Matabele greed. It is difficult for the Makalaka to get warning of the approach of the Matabele. These last are trained to rush forty miles, and fight at the end. The excuse for the raid was said to be the refusal to pay taxes. One village just off the line had been spared. When the people came to barter goods, we found it almost impossible to get definite information from them. They said they had taken the dead to the foot of the mountain, where the chief lived. They seemed to view the matter philosophically, pretty much as the poor at home take a surprise visit of the tax-gatherer. Altogether it was an interesting day. Leo, who can make himself understood, told the Gospel story with great warmth to attentive listeners—in fact, the poor people would have liked us to remain with them. The following day we outspanned near Father Barthelémy on the Tukuana, and were surrounded by eager barterers. Salt and beads were in great requisition, and the words *piccanimi* (too little) and *barsilla* (backsheech) were always on their lips."

A circumstance is here related by Father Kerr which shows the skill of the lay-brothers as craftsmen: "It was now just ten days since the smash of the wheel on the feast of the Sacred Heart. Every one said a wheel could not be made on the road,



and of course our loaned wheel made us independent. Nevertheless the Brothers had determined to attempt to make one. Brother Book and Brother Meyer had been quietly at work. Spare and broken dissel-booms supplied seasoned wood. The sixteen spokes were shaped accordingly, then came the fitting into the nave and breaking out and fitting on the felloes with much exactness, so that the old tire should serve again. All the centring and scientific measurement required surprised me, and now by the waters of the little Tukwe they heated the tire and completed their work. Their success proved them indeed to be master wheelwrights. That evening a bad drift had to be crossed over the Tukwe proper, by moonlight, and the poor oxen had to suffer. How mails and passengers get across in bad weather I cannot conceive. Broken bones, boats, and ropes tell a tale; but licenses are heavy, and store-keepers are glad to get a reduction by contracting to help the mails. Here was a cheery store-keeper evidently doing well. I gave him our loaned wheel to return, and he added two sheep to our stock, as empty bags were still the rule. Fern Sperit, a pretty brook at the foot of what is called Providential Gorge, was now reached. The veldt is well wooded, but the grass was burnt and the scene desolate. One is inclined to forget it is mid-winter, and thus not to give Nature her due, unless reminded by autumn tints and leafless bush."

Only twelve miles more to Fort Victoria! All looked forward to this trek. On their way Father Kerr and Father Barthelemy visited a mining camp a mile up the valley, among the low hills which clothe the base of the higher range. It was a good specimen of a camp, and belonged to the Mashonaland Agency Company. Mr. Stokes, the General Manager, was "at home," and kindly took them round. The stamp was being erected on a convenient site. One hundred tons of quartz lay ready waiting. They saw the shaft, fifty feet deep, and a variety of openings and deep cuttings, all laying bare auriferous stone. The reef cropped up most unexpectedly and dipped again, but there was a rich vein, and their hopes ran high. Altogether a promising station, but that season they had had much fever to contend with. They heard of a Catholic trader in a neighbouring valley. Father Kerr told them if they would use the opportunity they should have Mass. Father Berg therefore stayed with them a night, and gave them the opportunity of Easter duties.

"Meanwhile they had ascended the so-called gorge, spending the mid hours of night half way. Lions rampant were likely visitors, but none called. It was here, however, the sick man Cock (with whom and his brother we had made friends some days before) was 'visited' *en route* for the south. 'It was a simple affair,' he said. 'They heard a movement among the oxen, and there was a general fright and disturbance for a moment or so among the stock, and then all was quiet again, and hearing the bell on one of the donkeys ringing as usual, they thought all was right, and went back into the wagons. Next morning it was discovered that the lion had been ringing the bell as he devoured the poor donkey. It was good of him to be so easily satisfied, as he generally paws half a dozen at once! The remains were well poisoned before he returned the next night to finish off the repast, which he did thoroughly.' Daylight found us at the top of the rise, with the high plateau in front and the gorge behind. The latter, on reflection, I found to be disappointing. There was hardly any true gorge. It was more like the gentle swell of the ocean up a river-bed. I believe the rise is only a few hundred feet. To the left rather a fine line of hills culminates in Mount Victoria, which rises some twelve hundred feet above the plateau. At their foot begins a gradual slope of bush veldt of varying width, which becomes narrower and more sparse till the last bush about the point where at sunrise we outspanned for Mass. On the right, kopjes and hills succeeded each other and struck away east as far as Zimbalye and the watershed of the deadly Sabi. The landscape in front breathed new life into the soul; the absence of bush gave a sense of freedom, and the extensive plain running away north and east for miles without interruption made one feel in the presence of a new world. On the left lay Fort Victoria, marked by a few huts and stones, standing in the centre of the western end of the plateau. The scene is most desolate, and the hills only partly relieve it. Besides which all the grass is burnt, especially in the gold veldt, which runs east and west with a width of twenty miles. Altogether, neither picture nor frame can compare to similar views in Cashmere or Mexico."

The wagons were sent on to the next water, at the new township, while the Fathers went to visit the older town.

## *The Divine Office in the Greek Church.*

---

### 3.—THE CONSTITUENT PARTS OF THE AKOLOUTHIA.

IT is now time for us to turn to the Office itself, and I believe I could not adopt a better way of giving some little idea of it, than by first speaking of its constituent parts severally, and by afterwards analyzing each of the Canonical Hours. I shall first speak of the *Psalms*.

Canonical Hours of some kind existed already among the Jews, and are mentioned in various places in Holy Scripture. Thus we find an allusion to a number of daily prayers in Psalm cxviii. verses 62 and 164: "I rose at midnight to give praise to Thee;" and, "Seven times a day I have given praise to Thee." The last of these two verses is partly illustrated in the New Testament, where some of the hours of prayers are mentioned, incidentally, it is true, but as a thing well known to the reader: "Now Peter and John went up into the Temple, at the ninth hour of prayer."<sup>1</sup> The construction is significant: they did not go up to prayer at the ninth hour of the day, just as they might have gone at any other hour, but the phrase, "ninth hour of prayer," evidently points to a service established before that particular occasion and familiar to those for whom the Acts were meant in the first instance. Again, Acts x. 3 and 30: [Cornelius] "saw in a vision manifestly, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God." . . . "Cornelius said: 'Four days ago, unto this hour, I was praying in my house at the ninth hour.'" In the same chapter, the 9th verse: "Peter went up to the higher parts of the house, to pray about the sixth hour." Given these formal texts, it is undoubtedly more than a mere coincidence, that the Apostles "were all together in one place"<sup>2</sup> at the third hour on the day of Pentecost.

Whether the young Church received a tradition from the Synagogue as to certain hours and forms of prayer,

<sup>1</sup> Acts iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Acts ii. 1.

and developed the same, or whether she went her own way in this matter, I am not prepared to discuss or decide; but it cannot be denied that there are traces of such an institution even before anchorites and monks brought it to perfection. It was in the deserts of Nitria and the Thebaid, where monasticism first grew into a system, that the Divine Office was regularly established; and thence it spread over the whole Church. It would, however, be a mistake to believe that there reigned anything like uniformity in the various colonies of holy anchorites, and in the many different countries.

A glance at the various systems will largely contribute to the understanding of the Greek Office. The principal sources from which the Divine Office was (and is even now) derived, are the Psalms and Canticles of Holy Writ, lessons from the same, and prayers and supplications according to the needs of the Church. Cassian<sup>1</sup> gives the most valuable information on this point. First he states that some have fixed on twenty or thirty psalms for each night; to which they added antiphons (or, as we should call them, responses); some have even exceeded this number; others say only eighteen psalms during the night; while at the daily Offices some chant three psalms at each of the "Hours," others six; some three at the third Hour, six at the sixth Hour, and so on. He then goes on to state that throughout Egypt and the Thebaid, twelve psalms are sung at Vespers and as many at Matins; nor was this number chosen at random, but it was fixed by an angel. One day, he relates, the Fathers were discussing the proper number of psalms to be sung during the night; before they had arrived at any decision Vesper-time came round. As usual the whole assembly sat or knelt down, while one of them rose to say the psalms, the others listening to his words. Having finished the twelfth psalm, and the community having answered, Alleluia, the singer suddenly disappeared from their sight, whence it became manifest that he was a messenger from Heaven. This fact brought both the discussion and the ceremony to an end.<sup>2</sup> From this time the rule was established to say twelve psalms at Vespers, and as many at Matins, and to add two lessons, one of the Old and one of the New Testament, except on Saturdays and Sundays and during Easter-time, when both lessons were taken from the New Testament.<sup>3</sup>

As to the way in which the psalms were recited, Cassian

<sup>1</sup> *De Consol. Inst.* ii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 6.

explains a little further on<sup>1</sup> that this was done by one monk (or ecclesiastic) standing up, while the whole congregation were sitting on low benches and listening to the chanter or reader. No one sang or read less than three, or more than six psalms, so that however numerous the congregation were, four monks at the most performed the whole service. This is the most ancient fashion of rendering the Divine Office, and we shall see that remnants of it still survive in the Greek Church. It is, however, not the only way, since the antiphonal singing, that is the singing of the alternate verses of the psalms by the two halves of the choir, was introduced and acquired preponderance in the fourth century. In the Western Churches it has entirely supplanted the older fashion,<sup>2</sup> while in the Eastern Church the two methods are used simultaneously.

To return to the question of the number of psalms, we have already heard Cassian's deposition. He, however, speaks only of one portion of the Church, and we must not omit to cast a glance at the practice in other portions.

The Coptic Breviary to the present day prescribes that the whole Psalter shall be recited day after day, though in reality this is only done in monasteries, whereas the secular clergy (speaking of the United Copts) say but one canonical Hour a day, thus completing the entire Psalter in the course of a week. May be that St. Benedict alludes to a custom similar to that of the Copts, when he says in his Rule,<sup>3</sup> that "we ought to do at least in a week what our fathers have done in a single day."

There is an old "canon" of psalms still extant, which is interesting because it looks like an analysis of those that have been in use ever since. It is associated with the name of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which probably accounts for its never having been adopted on a larger scale. I do not know with what right it is ascribed to Eusebius, but I consider it a valuable document whatever be the merit of its author. In this canon three psalms are prescribed for Vespers and as many for Matins, and one psalm for each hour of day and night, so that there are thirty psalms altogether. The canon gives only

<sup>1</sup> L.c. 11 and 12.

<sup>2</sup> I might, however, make an exception for the 94th Psalm, at the beginning of Matins, which is never sung by the choir, but by the chanters.

<sup>3</sup> Chapter xviii. Compare also the *Ordo Monasticus* of *Kil-Ros* (Scotland), where twenty psalms used to be said at each of the three Nocturns, and the remainder during the day, so that every day the whole Psalter was recited. (Migne, *Lat.* 59, 563.)

the disposition for one day, nor does it appear what is to happen with the remaining hundred and twenty psalms.<sup>1</sup>

Quite a different scheme is adopted in the Rule of St. Columbanus. Though belonging to the extreme Occident, it well deserves mention as an illustration of the variety of Offices as regards the number of psalms. St. Columbanus, then, draws a distinction between Saturday and Sunday night, and the other nights during the week. From the 1st of November to the 25th of March twenty-five antiphons are said on each of the two nights, each antiphon comprising three psalms, so that the whole Psalter is sung every week during these two nights. From the 25th of March until midsummer day the *pensum* diminishes by one antiphon with three psalms every Sunday, so that on, or about, the 24th of June there remained but twelve antiphons or thirty-six psalms. Then as the nights grow longer, every Sunday brings an additional antiphon, and by the 1st of November we have reached again twenty-five antiphons or seventy-five psalms. As to the other nights the Rule is not quite clear. It lays down the principle that at the beginning of the night twelve psalms should be said, in the middle twelve more, and at Matins twenty-four, always two under one antiphon. But the Rule directs also, that during the whole spring and summer only twenty-four psalms should be recited. I take it that the aforementioned forty-eight psalms constitute the winter *pensum*, which would decrease from week to week after March 25th, and (as it is expressly stated in the Rule) increase again from the 24th of September. This arrangement is really most interesting. The twelve psalms at Vespers (for this Hour is undoubtedly meant by the "beginning of the night"), the twelve psalms at Matins, and the exceedingly long morning Office, together with continual prayer during the whole night from Saturday to Sunday and from Sunday to Monday, decidedly point to an Eastern origin, while the great difference between long and short nights in winter and summer show us how the Office is adapted to the high latitude under which it was devised.<sup>2</sup>

Every "Hour" of the day exhibits three psalms and a number of versicles and prayers, first for our sins, next for all

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Gr.* 23, 1395.

<sup>2</sup> A recent German controversialist informs us that this Breviary breathes "Evangelical liberty," whereas the Benedictine Office is for him "an instance of Roman slavery." Whenever there is a question of big words, there is nothing like a good mouthful of them.



Christian peoples, then for priests and all persons consecrated to God in various degrees, then for those who have given us their alms, after that for peace, and finally for our enemies.<sup>1</sup>

I might easily enlarge this rapid sketch by reviewing other monastic rules, but none of them is half as important as that of St. Benedict, which is essentially Roman, and which not only prescribes most accurately what is to be sung at every single "Hour," but also points out where it diverges from the Roman Office. I do not know of any document showing so clearly the customs of Rome at the beginning of the sixth century as the Rule of the great Patriarch of Western monasticism.

The Roman Office contained already at that early date twelve psalms at Matins, followed by three lessons and as many responses. This is the invariable rule for week-days. On Sundays this is but the first part of the night Office, and is followed by two more parts, each consisting of three psalms, three lessons, and three responses, so that on Sundays the whole night service embraces eighteen psalms, and nine lessons and responses. St. Benedict introduced a slight change in the order of the psalms, and besides that he inserted the three lessons after the sixth psalm, that is in the middle of the service; this, however, only during the winter months, for during the rest of the year a short sentence of the Old Testament takes the place of the lessons. On Sundays and feast-days the Office is considerably increased. There are but twelve psalms still, yet instead of only three lessons and responses after the sixth psalm we find four lessons and responses both after the sixth and after the twelfth psalm, and these are followed by three canticles taken from the prophets and four more lessons and responses. In spite of the difference in detail, it is quite evident that the monastic Office is composed on the same principles as the Roman. Both these Offices have one peculiarity, for which we should look in vain in Eastern liturgies. On Sundays and ferial-days the psalms are taken in the same order as they occur in the Bible, and the whole Psalter is distributed over a whole week. But on feast-days a choice is made, the natural order is abandoned, and such psalms are recited as are most adapted to the subject of the feast. A further change is made in the Roman Office, by reducing the first nocturn from twelve to three psalms, so that there are

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Lat.* 80, 212.

altogether nine psalms, and as many lessons and responses.<sup>1</sup> St. Benedict, on the other hand, left the Offices of the saints exactly like that for Sunday, and only changed the psalms, lessons, and responses, and other variable parts. This is the most explicit characteristic of the Roman Office, just as the movable parts of the Mass are characteristic of that department of the Roman Liturgy. The latter was in this respect influenced by the Mozarabic Liturgy, and it is not impossible that the Mozarabic Breviary may also account for the proper psalms of the Roman Offices.

The two most solemn Offices of the day are Lauds and Vespers. They are more solemn, not only because they are usually sung even in churches where the rest of the Office as a rule is not sung. Indeed, they are chanted because they are more solemn; the chanting is not the cause of the solemnity, but the result. Vespers consist of five (in the Benedictine Breviary four) psalms, a hymn, and the Cantic of our Blessed Lady. Lauds, in like manner, contain five psalms (in reality there are more, but several go under one *Gloria Patri*, and are treated as if they were one; the same holds good, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Benedictine Breviary), a hymn, and the Cantic of Zacharias. The solemnity of these two Offices is enhanced by the use of vestments for the officiating priest, the use of lights on the altar (though the lights, as part of a ceremony, are of a comparatively late period), and the incensing of the altar during the singing of the canticles. This last reminds us strongly of the morning and evening incense of the Coptic Church, and we shall see presently to what a magnificent ceremony it has led in the Greek Church. At present I wish to draw the attention of the reader to the composition of Lauds. In the first place there are three psalms, which are partly varied according to the day and the season, partly invariable throughout the year; on Sundays and feast-days we say instead of a fourth psalm the Benedictions (as St. Benedict has it), that is, the Cantic of the Three Children in the furnace,<sup>2</sup> but with considerable changes: the refrain is everywhere omitted except in four places; the doxology is added by the Church, and the last verse is, with a slight change, the opening verse of the

<sup>1</sup> In reality the hymn *Te Deum* takes almost always the place of the last (third or ninth) response. I took no notice of this in the text, partly because it is not altogether relevant to our present purpose, partly also because it is a change introduced at a period when the Roman Breviary was already fully developed.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel iii. 57—88.

whole canticle. On week-days this canticle is omitted, and in its place we say on—

Mondays the Canticle of Isaias (xii. 1—6),		
Tuesdays	„ „	Ezechias (Isaias xxxviii. 10—20),
Wednesdays	„ „	Anne (1 Kings ii. 1—10),
Thursdays	„ „	Moses (Exodus xv. 1—19),
Fridays	„ „	Habacuc (iii. 2—19),
Saturdays	„ „	Moses (Deut. xxxii. 1—43).

St. Benedict makes only an insignificant change in this arrangement, and refers for the rest to the custom of the Roman Church.<sup>1</sup> I shall have an occasion to show that originally the Greek Church followed a scheme not unlike the one just described, though at present, nay, ever since her great hymnographers have embellished the Divine Office, it has become a totally different thing. The fifth place at Lauds is occupied by the "Lauds" properly so called, that is, the three Psalms cxlviii.—cl. thrown into one. This is never omitted, not even in the Office of the Dead or on Good Friday, and we find it in a corresponding position in the Greek Office.

As to the "Hours" of the day, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Compline, they never vary throughout the year (at least, not in their essential parts), and this not only in the Latin Church, but in other Churches also.

Acting on the principle, that—"to know only one language means to know none,"—I have endeavoured to sketch briefly the contents of the Roman (including the Benedictine) Breviary, and I am now anxious to return to the Greek Office. Here also the Psalms are the broad foundation upon which the whole building rests. The latter, however, has grown to such dimensions that the psalmody occupies quite a secondary rank. The leading principle here, as in every other Liturgy, is to say all the Psalms once a week. An exception is made in Lent, when the Psalter ought to be said twice every week in choir. I say in choir, because of the following rubric, which is too characteristic to be omitted here. It occurs on page 79 of the Triodion: "Behold, we have been accurately describing one day of the holy fast, and have transmitted to your charity the quantity of the Psalms, as also the inclinations and prostrations to be performed during the same, according to the prescriptions of the holy Fathers, which it is not lawful to omit. The inclinations (together with the genuflections and prostrations) which are performed in the church, are three hundred, without counting

<sup>1</sup> Chap. 13.

the midnight Office. In Palestine we have been taught to say the Psalter also in our cells, and those who are able to do so, finish it in a day and a night; others, three times, others twice a week. And we make so many inclinations, &c., as the Superior shall order to each in accordance with his strength."

In Holy Week, the Psalter must be finished before Wednesday evening, after which it is laid aside altogether until the eve of Low Sunday. Of course, some psalms are said even during this time, but very few, and no regular psalmody takes place.

As I have mentioned before, the Psalter is divided into twenty parts of about equal length; they are called Kathismata. Each of them is again subdivided into three sections, each finishing with a *Gloria Patri*. It should be borne in mind that the singing of the doxology after every psalm is peculiar to the Roman Office, into which it was introduced by Pope St. Damasus. In the Greek, the Coptic, and, I believe, also in other Eastern Liturgies, it is never said at the end of the psalms, unless it be specially prescribed by the rubrics.

As to the distribution of the Psalter during the week, I have been looking in vain for authoritative information. I even consulted people whom I was entitled to consider well versed in the Greek Liturgy, but nothing but disappointment was the result. Having gathered together all the rubrics on the subject, I was able to arrange the following table, which I give not without warning the reader that it may require correction:

	Midnight.	Matins.	Vespers.
Saturday ...			1—8
Sunday ...	—	9—16, 17—23, 118, <sup>1</sup> 119—133	—
Monday ...	118	24—31, 32—36 [37—45]	37—45 or 119—133
Tuesday ...	118	46—54, 55—63 [64—69]	64—69 or 119—133
Wednesday.	118	70—76, 77—84 [85—90]	85—90 or 119—133.
Thursday...	118	91—100, 101—104 [105—108]	105—108 or 119—133
Friday .....	118	109—117, 134—142	—
Saturday ...	64—69	143—150, 118	1—8

<sup>1</sup> On feasts of our Lord the 118th Psalm is left out, and the 135th, the "psalm of many mercies," is said in its stead.

A few words of explanation are necessary. At the midnight Office the Psalm *Beati immaculati* is always said except on Saturdays, when other psalms take its place, and on Sundays, when the "canon" of the Blessed Trinity is sung in its stead. In these two cases it is recited at Matins, and on Sundays it is followed by the Gradual Psalms. The remaining psalms have been inserted in the order of the Psalter, according to this rule, that every day there are three *στιχολόγαι* (recitations of psalms), except on Saturdays, when there is but one before the 118th.

With regard to Vespers, the Psalterion lays down the law in this way: From the 20th of September, three Kathismata are said at Matins, and the Gradual Psalms at Vespers. From Christmas until January 14th (the last day of the solemnities of Epiphany), two Kathismata at Matins, and the third at Vespers<sup>1</sup> (which on the table is shown in brackets). From this day till Septuagesima, again three at Matins and the Gradual Psalms at Vespers; during the two weeks preceding Lent there are but two Kathismata at Matins and the third at Vespers, "as a little relief," and the same is practised from Low Sunday until the 20th of September, the anticipated octave of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. On Sunday evenings and at Vespers after the greater feasts, the psalms are always omitted (except the usual ones), on account of the prolonged watching during the previous night. As far as I can see, those psalms which are taken out of their order, as for instance, the psalms of the Little Hours, are not, on that account, omitted when their turn in the *στιχολογία* comes round.

To complete this enumeration, I will also give a list of the psalms set aside for the Little Hours. It goes almost without saying, that the psalms of praise, 148—150, occupy their customary place at the end of the morning Office. At Prime the Greek Church sings Psalms 5, 89, 100. At Terce 16, 24, 50. At Sext 53, 54, 90. At the Communion Service 102, 145, 33. Before dinner 144. At grace after dinner 121. At None 83, 84, 85. At the greater Compline 4, 6, 12, 24, 30, 90, 50, 101, 69, 142.<sup>2</sup> At the lesser Compline 50, 69, 142. At the midnight Office there are, besides the psalms mentioned in the table, 50, 120, 133, and at Matins 19 and 20. No doubt the reader will

<sup>1</sup> However, on Fridays no psalms are recited at Vespers.

<sup>2</sup> This Office is only performed during Lent. For the rest of the year lesser Compline takes its place.

begin to understand that it is hard work for a Greek clergyman to fulfil his daily *pensum*. Yet I have not come to the end as yet. All I have hitherto done is to enumerate those psalms that are said or sung by the whole choir in alternate verses. But as I remarked before, the Greek Office has still a remnant of the old practice, which required that one member of the community should read or sing the psalms all alone. In this way are recited the Hexapsalmus, or the six psalms at Matins, which follow Psalms 19 and 20 above mentioned. These six psalms are 3, 37, 62, 87, 102, 142, and the rubric says: "We begin the six psalms listening with deep silence and contrition; the Brother who has the office, or the Superior, says with trembling and fear of God, 'Glory be to God in the highest,' &c., three times; 'Lord, open Thou my lips' (twice). After which he begins the psalms. After the third, the priest comes out of the sanctuary and says silently the morning prayers before the picture of the Lord Christ, and in the meantime the three last psalms are read."

*The Canticles.*—There are other parts of Holy Scripture not inserted in the Book of Psalms, but, like the latter, hymns to the praise of God, most magnificent products of sacred lyric poetry. They are called canticles, and have ever formed an important part of the Divine Liturgy. The Roman Church recites every morning the Cantic of Zacharias, every evening that of our Blessed Lady, and every night that of Simeon, all three taken from the two first chapters of St. Luke. Other canticles are inserted at Lauds, as I have shown above. The Greek Church has her canticles also. At Vespers the Cantic of Simeon is never omitted. For the rest, I will give a table of the nine (or rather ten) odes or canticles.

- I. Cantic of Moses (Exodus xv. 1—19), cf. Rom. Brev. Thursday.
- II. Cantic of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 1—43), Rom. Brev. Saturday.
- III. Cantic of Anne (1 Kings ii. 1—10), Rom. Brev. Wednesday.
- IV. Cantic of Habacuc (iii. 2—19), Rom. Brev. Friday.
- V. Cantic of Isaías (xxvi. 9—20), Bened. Brev. Christmas, second cantic.
- VI. Cantic of Jonas (ii. 3—10).



- VII. Canticle of the Three Children (Daniel iii. 26—56),  
Rom. Missal, Ember Saturday in Advent, Lent, and  
September.
- VIII. Canticle of the Three Children (Daniel iii. 57—81),<sup>1</sup> Rom.  
Brev. Sunday.
- IX. Canticle of our Blessed Lady (St. Luke i. 46—55), and  
Canticle of Zacharias (St. Luke i. 68—79), Rom. Brev.  
Vespers and Lauds.

The last two canticles, taken from the same chapter of the Gospel, count for one. Now, what use does the Greek Church make of these odes? It is surprising that a man of the calibre of a Nicolas Rayaëus, one of the Bollandists, should have utterly failed to understand the place occupied by them. In his edition of the feast of SS. John Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil the Great,<sup>2</sup> he says that the first canticle is said on Sunday and Monday, the second on Tuesday, the third on Wednesday, the fourth on Thursday, the fifth on Friday, the sixth on Saturday. For the seventh he gives no indication, the eighth he omits altogether, and of the two which are thrown together in the ninth place, he says that "they are sung at another time," without, however, specifying it. Now, there can be no doubt that originally the canticles were really distributed over the whole week. We have a proof of this practice, even a remnant of it, in Lent, when (with some exceptions) they occur in the following series: Monday, 1, 8, 9; Tuesday, 2, 8, 9; Wednesday, 3, 8, 9; Thursday, 4, 8, 9; Friday, 5, 8, 9. But during the rest of the year all of them, with the exception of the second, which is reserved for Lent, are said every single day. There can be no possible doubt about this fact, however surprising it may seem. The rubrics of the Psalter, of the Horologium, of the Parakletike, in fact of every liturgical book, show it so clearly that I need not give any further proofs, and, besides, the "canons" of which I shall speak presently are the best proof themselves. I will only quote a passage from the Constitutions of the famous Monastery Studium, near Constantinople (whence St. Theodore the Studite, 759—826, and his brother Joseph and some of their disciples derive their surnames), where it is said<sup>3</sup> that *every morning at Matins* the Abbot shall leave the

<sup>1</sup> As it stands in the Bible, not shortened as we have it at Lauds on Sundays and feast-days.

<sup>2</sup> *Acta SS.* June 2, p. xiii. reprinted, Migne, *Gr.* 29, p. cccxvi.

<sup>3</sup> § 22.

church as soon as *the fourth canticle is begun*, and that he shall take a seat and receive the Brothers who come to make their confession, and that he shall heal each one with a wholesome remedy.<sup>1</sup> It ought to be mentioned, however, that the canticles are not always recited from beginning to end, but, at least on feasts and on Sundays, when the Office is so long, they are shortened. In this case the recitation begins at the fourth, sixth, or eighth verse from the end (including the *Gloria Patri* where it is to be said), and the higher the feast the nearer to the end does the recitation begin. Thus, on the feast of the Nativity of our Lady, the first canticle would begin with the words: "Then were the princes of Edom troubled."<sup>2</sup> At other occasions the same canticle would begin with the words: "Until Thy people, O Lord, pass by;" and in some cases it would begin right at the end: "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever, for Pharaoh went in on horseback with his chariots and horsemen into the sea, and the Lord brought back upon them the waters of the sea, but the children of Israel walked on dry ground in the midst thereof. Glory be to the Father," &c. The other canticles, with the exception of the second, which is always said entirely, are treated in the same manner, as also the Vesper psalm, "I have cried to Thee, O Lord," a composition of Psalms 140, 141, 129, and 116. The Lauds, that is, the three last psalms (148—150), are never shortened, but on Sundays and feasts of our Lord, or the feasts of the principal saints, at the midnight Office they are left out and the following versicles take their place: "Let every spirit praise the Lord. Praise ye the Lord from the heavens, praise ye Him in the high places. A hymn, O God, becometh Thee." These are the only cases of shortening the psalms.

*The Canon.*—It was necessary first to explain the practice of the Greek Church with regard to the canticles, before attempting to speak of the canon, for this is a piece of poetry based upon the canticles, and consisting of a number of verses, in which the subject of the canticle and that of the feast or mystery which is being celebrated are blended together. As there are nine canticles, so a canon has nine odes, each of which contains four or five, or even more, troparia. The second ode, however, is always left out, as the second canticle is only sung on Tuesdays in Lent. I have shown before that during that

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Gr.* 99, 1711.<sup>2</sup> Verse 15.

season there are but three canticles to be said on week-days from Monday to Friday (with a few exceptions), consequently the canons during that time consist for the greater part of only three odes, hence the name of the book containing the Proper of Lent: *Triodion*.<sup>1</sup> The Greek Church has a wonderful facility of combinations. One canon alone is scarcely ever sung, at least two, often three, being linked together. For instance, after the *Heirmus*, the opening verse, which gives the tune and the quantity to the *troparia*, there may be four verses on the Resurrection, which are followed by a different canon on the Apostles, and a third one on our Lady (each being of four verses), after which the choir sings the "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." Then comes a *Theotokion*, that is, an anthem in praise of our Lady, and finally the "Now and for ever, world without end. Amen." All this belongs to the first canticle, and the third, and the following up to the ninth, have each of them so many verses for each of the three canons. Without entering on the subject of *Heirmus*, *Katabasia*, *Oikos*, *Kontakion*, &c.—names of certain parts of the canon, on which the Greeks themselves seem rather puzzled—we can now understand what a fertile field is opened here for the poet. Readers of Dom Guéranger's *Liturgical Year* know the beauty of the Greek Liturgy from numerous specimens, all of which are taken from canons. The anthems in honour of the Blessed Virgin are especially numerous. A Jesuit, Simon Wagnerecchius, began a separate publication of all the Greek *Theotokia*, but after the first half, containing a thousand, the work was stopped; he might, however, easily have brought it to an end, and added a second thousand to it. There can be no question as to the fondness of the Greeks for their "canons." They have contrived to make them almost the crowning point of their Office, and not content with three of them after only a few verses of the canticles, they occasionally use canons without any canticles at all, as, for instance, at the midnight Office on Sundays, or at Compline, when a commemoration of a saint is

<sup>1</sup> The origin of the name *Parakletike* is not so manifest as that of the *Triodion*. But those who believe it to be an extract of the *Oktoechos*, as, e.g., the writer of the article on Greek Liturgy in Herzog's *Theol. Encyclop.* Second Edition, are certainly mistaken. *Parakletike* and *Greater Oktoechos* are but two titles of one and the same book; while the *Lesser Oktoechos*, in the Appendix of the Anthologion, contains merely the eight Sunday Offices without the week-days. At this occasion I may also remark that the feast of the Conception of St. John the Baptist at one time was being kept in Italy. (See the Mass in Migne, *Lat.* 138, 903.)

to be made. I must not omit to say that the canons, like all the other parts of the Liturgy, are in prose ; though some of the Greek Fathers, as, for instance, St. Gregory Nazianzen, have written admirable hymns for every possible occurrence, these latter have never been admitted into the Divine Office. Only on rare occasions, such as Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost, part of the canon is in the iambic metre. There are some canons which ought not to be passed over in silence. I have already mentioned the "standing hymn," the composition of either the Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, or George of Pisa, his contemporary, archivist of the "Great Church."

It is, in my opinion, the most beautiful piece of poetry that was ever uttered by human lips in honour of our Lady, and though I am far from doing justice to such an elaborate work, I cannot forego the pleasure of inserting at least the first (of twelve)-parts :

The Prince of Angels was sent from Heaven to say Hail Mary to the Mother of God, and seeing Thee, O Lord, become Man, he fell in a trance, and standing motionless, said to her these words with his spiritual voice :

Hail, through thee grace shineth forth,  
 Hail, blotted out is the curse through thee,  
 Hail, restitution of fallen Adam,  
 Hail, consolation of the tears of Eve ;  
 Hail, height never reached by the thought of man,  
 Hail, depth too deep for Angelical eyes,  
 Hail, thou who art chosen the Throne of the King,  
 Hail, thou who bearest the Bearer of all ;  
 Hail, star illuming the sun himself,  
 Hail, womb encompassing the man-made God ;  
 Hail, thou through whom the world is renewed,  
 Hail, thou who call'st the Creator thy child,  
 Hail, Virgin ever a virgin !

But the Holy Virgin, knowing her own purity, said boldly to Gabriel : "Thy wonderful words seem too difficult for my mind ; for how shall I have a son not knowing a man ?" and she said : "Alleluia."

This hymn has found some imitators ; thus we have a canon on the Holy Cross in exactly the same style. Two other canons must be mentioned here : the first is that for the feast of the Annunciation ; it is in form of a dialogue between our Lady and the Angel Gabriel, a really poetical work, but the most remarkable canon is the one which bears the name "great canon," which is sung in parts on four evenings of the first

week in Lent, and in its whole length at Matins on Wednesday of the third last week of Lent. It is the work of St. Andrew, Archbishop of Creta (who died 720 or 723), and is a review of the whole history of sinful and fallen mankind. It contains some two hundred and seventy troparia, at each of which the whole community make three genuflections.

As a rule the canons are written in acrostics, that is, the first letters of each troparion, put together, form a short sentence, a hexameter, the name of the author, or, as it happens very often indeed, the whole alphabet.<sup>1</sup> As to the authors, there are canons by St. John Damascene, and other great divines of the Greek Church, but the greatest number of them is due to the pen of Joseph, the hymnographer, brother of St. Theodore the Studite.

*Anthems.*—I deliberately make no use of the term antiphon, because this word has a specific meaning in the Roman Breviary, for which there is scarcely an analogy to be found in the Greek Office. An antiphon with us is a short sentence, which is sung or recited before and after each psalm, and resumes, as it were, the principal idea of the psalm, connecting it with the feast that is being celebrated. Antiphons of this kind occur only in the Hexapsalmus, after the last psalm at None and the first at Vespers, and are invariable. Thus, after the first of the "six psalms," the verse is repeated: "I have slept and have taken my rest, and I have risen up, because the Lord hath protected me." This may certainly be considered as a kind of rudimentary antiphon. What the Greeks call Antiphonon, has nothing to do with what we understand by this word; it is, in reality, a response. But there is a great number of anthems in every part of the Office, principally at Vespers, Matins, and Lauds. They bear various names, such as versicles, verses, *idiomela*, (that is anthems which are sung *recto tono* on one note), *automela* (or anthems which have a tune of their own), *prosomoia* (that is anthems which are sung according to the tune of others). Again, they are called according to their contents, *Staurosima*, when they refer to the Crucifixion, *Anastasima*, when they treat of the Resurrection, *Martyrica*, when they are in honour of the holy martyrs. Without entering into details, which my space renders impossible, I will simply

<sup>1</sup> Compare the hymn at Lauds for Christmas: *A solis ortus cardine. Beatus auctor seculi. Clause parentis viscera, &c.* Unfortunately the continuation of this hymn, *Hostis Herodes impie*, at Vespers on Epiphany, has undergone changes and omissions, so that the alphabetical order is disturbed.

point out that we meet at times with words which are familiar to us. Thus, at Vespers of the second Tuesday after Easter we meet a Staurosimon which we cannot help recognizing as our second antiphon at Lauds in the Office of the Holy Cross. "Save me, Saviour Christ, through the virtue of the Cross, Thou who didst save Peter on the sea, have mercy on me, O God."

*Prayers.*—Considering that all these anthems and all the verses of the canons are addressed to Almighty God, the Blessed Trinity, or to one or the other of the Persons of the same, to our Lord, our Lady, the angels or saints, we cannot be surprised at not finding prayers similar to those which we call collects. But the Greek Church very frequently makes use of what we should call *preces*, that is a series of versicles and responses for all the needs of the Church and the faithful, and, at the end of it, an unchangeable prayer, much like the *preces* and *oremus* at Prime and Compline and other parts of our Office. Besides these there are numerous long and beautiful prayers at Vespers and Matins, as also at other "Hours." But the most common thing is the cry *Kyrie eleison*, which is repeated twelve, forty, fifty, even a hundred times, always accompanied by a deep inclination.<sup>1</sup> It may not be out of place to inform the reader that the variation *Christe eleison* is peculiar to the Roman Church, which owes it to St. Gregory the Great. The Greeks, as well as the Copts and other Oriental Christians, only say *Kyrie eleison*, multiplying it, however, in the most fatiguing way. Another peculiarity is the use of the *Alleluia*. It is a joyful exclamation meaning, "Praise ye the Lord." The Roman Church does not make use of it during the penitential season, nor at the funerals of adults, nor at any mournful service. For this practice the Greeks did not hesitate (long before the schism) to blame the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, but only to fall into an opposite and most incomprehensible extreme. For them the *Alleluia* has become the signal of fasting and mourning, and is never used now on any other occasion. Surely it is not difficult to say which of the two rites is the most tasteful and appropriate in this respect.

<sup>1</sup> The Constitutions of Studium give a rather curious description of this practice. (§ 10.) At the conclusion of the psalmody we say *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison* (this last is most certainly an interpolation), and first we make three deep inclinations, all at the same time as the Superior; at which inclinations we all raise our arms somewhat towards God. Afterwards we make twenty more inclinations, as quickly as each one can do it. (Migne, *Gr.* 99, 1707.)



## *Human Responsibility.*

---

MAN has been so made as to have knowledge of himself, of his fellow-creatures, and of his Maker. Every human being has a mind, and knows that he has a mind. He knows that his mind is made for knowledge. The mind craves for knowledge, and with possession of knowledge the mind is satisfied. The craving ceases when knowledge is had with certainty, and the mind is then at rest.

Through knowledge of the true the human mind is intellectually perfected. Knowledge is nevertheless in man's mind not merely in order to his intellectual perfection, but in order also to the action of that knowledge on another power of the human soul.

Every human being has a will, and knows that he has a will. This will is of itself a blind power. It requires enlightenment. This is derived to it from the mind, or intellectual and rational power. The will is capable of movement and direction, and it is moved and directed by that which the mind supplies. The knowledge in the mind which moves the will is therefore called the *motive* of the will. It is the mainspring of its action. To act from an adequate motive is to act humanly, or as befits a human being. To act without a motive is to act unreasonably, and such an act is unworthy of the name of—a human act.

It is the act of one who is a human being, but it is not the act of a man—as he is a human being. It is not in accordance with the constitution and law of man's *human* being.

When the human will acts with an adequate motive, in knowledge supplied by the mind or reason, a man is not only intellectually, but morally perfected. As intellectual perfection is the perfection of the intellect, under its various aspects, or in its various faculties, as it is the understanding, mind, or reason, so all moral perfection is in the will. The will is the highest power of the human soul, and moral perfection, or perfection of the will, is the highest perfection of which the human soul is capable in the natural order.

Man has memory, and memory is a spiritual power, or a power which belongs to the human soul, as that soul is a spiritual being. The soul of man is not merely the principle of life to man's body. It has its own independent life, and survives the destruction of the body. When disembodied, it retains and exercises its powers of willing, of understanding, and of remembering. But although the memory is a spiritual power, it is the lowest of the three powers which belong to every spiritual being. It is an ancillary power. It serves as the handmaid of the understanding, while the understanding in its turn subserves the will in order to human action.

For our present purpose we may set aside the memory, and with it all lower powers which belong to man, such as his imagination and his animal appetites, and confine our attention simply to those two—the human reason and the human will.

It is through those two spiritual powers that man is master of his actions. His free-will is his faculty of reasoning and willing. Those of his actions, therefore, are properly *human* actions, which proceed from his deliberate will. Those acts do not deserve the name of *human* acts, which are done without any deliberation of the reason—such as are the very first movements of the passions, thoughts which precede deliberation, and actions which are done without advertence. By *human* acts, or acts of a man as he is a human being, we understand therefore those acts only which proceed from a man as from an intelligent principle, who has mastery over his own acts, or, in other words, those acts which proceed from the human will, with advertence of the reason and with freedom.

Such human acts alone are *moral* acts. All morality is in the will. It is rooted therein, and springs therefrom. Morality begins with the first act of dominion of the will in any action. The will is the royal and imperial power in man. It is the hinge and helm of all human and moral action. Moral actions alone deserve praise or blame and merit reward or punishment. For moral actions alone is man responsible before God. In moral action the reason and the will are wedded, and a moral act is the offspring of their union, for either good or evil.

2.

To command the other human powers belongs to the imperial will alone. The acts which proceed from other human powers, whether internal or external, at the command of the

will, are called *commanded* acts, to distinguish them from the acts of the will which proceed immediately from the will, and which are known in moral science by the name of *elicited* acts.

As the *true* is the proper object of the understanding, or that towards which it of its nature tends, so the *good* is the proper object of the will. It is the function of the understanding to present the good to the will. The principal functions of the will with regard to the good are six in number. It is said to will, to intend, to enjoy, to choose, to consent, and to use. A good which is set before the will by the understanding is either in itself an *end* which is desirable for its own sake, or it is a *means* which is desirable for the sake of the end, towards the attainment of which it is ordained. When it is in itself an end, then the will is said to *will* or embrace that good which allures it, and which it follows. When, for the sake of this end, other goods are sought, as they are means towards that end, the will is said to *intend*, or aim at that end. When the will rests in possession of the good, it is then said to *enjoy*. When various means towards an end are proposed by the understanding, and one of these is selected, the will is said to *choose*. Apart from comparison, and simply as approving and embracing, the will is said to *consent*, as agreeing with the understanding. When the will employs the means approved and chosen, it is said to *use*. All other acts of the will may be reduced to those six: as *desire* to intention, and *love* to willing—if it may not rather be said that *love* both wills and intends, and also enjoys. *Hope* is an intending towards a good of the future, which is difficult indeed of attainment, but at the same time not impossible to attain to. *Delight* falls under joy, and from delight joy is scarcely to be distinguished.

### 3.

The will, instructed by the understanding, and thereby moved and directed, has its issue in action. Its acts may be either good or bad, natural or supernatural. *Good* acts are acts which are in conformity with a rule of the moral law, which either prescribes or counsels them. *Bad* acts are acts which are contrary to the prescription of such a rule. Acts which are neither in conformity with nor contrary to any moral rule, are called *indifferent* acts. These acts may however become good or bad, as they are done for a good or for an evil end, or, in other words, by reason of the motive. The goodness of an act

may be derived from its being merely counselled, and not prescribed ; but in order that it should be bad, the act must have been prescribed, and not merely counselled. If, however, the rule which counsels an act is held in contempt, this is in itself evil, as contrary to a rule and prescription of moral law which forbids such contempt.

*Natural* acts are acts which are elicited solely by the natural faculties. *Supernatural* acts are acts which are elicited with the aid of Divine grace. These are called meritorious acts. They may be meritorious either as worthy of reward, and that of justice, or inasmuch as the reward of them is becoming, although not of justice, but only of the benignity of God. Even if an act concerns an object which has been supernaturally revealed, it nevertheless remains a natural act, if it has been elicited by the powers of nature alone. In order that, on the other hand, acts should be supernatural, it is not necessary that the objects of them should be supernatural. It suffices if they are done with the aid of Divine grace. They may in themselves be acts of natural virtues.

## 4.

Every moral act, that is to say, every act which is morally either good or bad, must have proceeded from the will, as from its intrinsic principle. The will is the rational appetite. It is called an appetite, because by a natural propension and with an affection of its own it rises and tends towards the object which is set before it as good. It is called *rational*, because this object or end is set before it by the reason as good either in reality or in appearance. The end or object may not be in reality good, but it must present itself under at least the appearance of the good, if it is to attract and move the will ; in the same way as the object which presents itself to the understanding may not be really true, but it must present itself under the appearance of the true, if the understanding is to embrace it as the truth. The understanding cannot possibly, or of its nature, accept as truth that which presents itself to it as untrue, or under the appearance of the untrue ; and, in like manner, the will, of its very nature, cannot be attracted or moved with affection towards that which is presented to it nakedly as an evil, and not clothed with at least the appearance of some good. The false and the evil must come disguised if they are to commend themselves to the understanding and the will.

When a movement of the will which proceeds from previous intellectual knowledge is absolute, the idea of the *voluntary* is complete, and the act which results is a voluntary act. It is the legitimate offspring of the will, whose name (*voluntas*) it bears, as the will is not merely an appetite, but the rational appetite. When the movement of the will is not absolute, but as it were suspended, and dependent on some condition, there is then a *wish* rather than a *will*. It is more—I would, than—I will. This wish, if it is to be called a will, must be qualified with some addition. It must, in order to distinguish it from an absolute and efficacious will, be called an *inefficacious* will, or a will of mere *complacence*. An efficacious will proceeds to action, and takes the means towards the end which it desires, and which is represented to it as possible of attainment. If the end is not presented to the will as possible, the will does not adopt the necessary means, and therefore is inefficacious. Inasmuch, however, as it rests with pleasure on the thought of the end which it would have willed and sought after, if its attainment had appeared to be possible, or if that end could have been arrived at without use of the means as a necessary condition, this resting with pleasure on the unattempted end is called a will of *complacence*.

An object may be *willed*, by a great desire of its existence, or by the will's resting with pleasure on its existence when it occurs, while at the same time the existence or attainment of that object is not from the will as is an effect from its cause. So far as the object is concerned, it may be said to be *willed*, but since its existence has not proceeded from the will, the act of willing is not said to be voluntary. Concurrence of the will and the will's use of means are necessary to the idea of the *voluntary* in connection with that which is willed. The misfortune of another, through which some good accrues to one, may be willed, but it is not *voluntary* unless the will has in some way concurred to inflict it. This willing, whether as an evil desire of the misfortune, or as joy and satisfaction, is itself, however, voluntary, inasmuch as it proceeds from the will.

If there is adequate knowledge and full deliberation, the element of the voluntary is complete and perfect. If the knowledge has been imperfect, or if there has not been full deliberation, the element of the voluntary will be imperfect.

When two objects are set by the understanding before the will, and the will has an affection towards both of them, but,

since it cannot embrace both of them, prefers one to the exclusion of the other, it wills both. It, however, more wills the one, which it therefore chooses, and less wills the other, which it therefore sets aside. Towards the one the will rises efficaciously; towards the other it also rises, but ineffaciously. With regard, therefore, to the one object there is a *will*, and with regard to the other there is only a *wish*. The one will is absolute or simple, the other will is relative or conditioned. It is a will of *inefficacious complacence*.

There is a real difference between interpretative consent and tacit consent. In *interpretative* consent there is presumed the consent which would have been, if the matter had been brought forward. In *tacit* consent there is understood a consent which really exists, although it has not been expressed.

The common saying, that "silence seems to give consent," requires some interpretation. He who keeps silence with regard to matters which are in favour of himself, is held to give consent—because in cases of doubt that is rightly presumed to exist to which natural tendency or inclination leads. Again, one is held to have given consent by silence when he could have easily prevented his own loss, by means of express dissent, or when he could in the same way have easily prevented an evil which he was bound to prevent, and he nevertheless kept silence. But silence never gives consent when words or express signs of consent are demanded by law in order to the existence of legal consent. When there is adequate proof of dissent, it is clear that mere silence cannot be held to have given consent.

##### 5.

An effect which follows from an action or omission may be *voluntary*, not in itself, but—in its cause. We are not now speaking of an effect which is intended. Such an effect is voluntary in itself. It is in reality an end. The effect to which we refer is one which is not an end, and does not move to action. It is not a motive of the action of which it is an effect. Although such an effect is not sought in itself, and is outside the intention, it nevertheless follows from the action. It is also a bad effect, for here there is no question of a good effect, since there cannot be moral goodness in any act if the will which precedes and causes it is not good. By reason of the bad effect, which I do not intend or desire, but which I know will follow from a certain action, I am bound to abstain from that action,



and I am responsible for this effect, if I do not abstain from the action which is its cause.

In order to induce this responsibility, however, three conditions are required. One must, in the first place, have knowledge of the evil effect, since nothing is willed which is not foreknown. One must, secondly, be free not to do the action, and so place the cause which has the evil effect. One must, thirdly, be bound not to do the action, and bound, moreover, for this reason, lest that evil effect should follow. Unless a man is bound not to act, he is free to exercise his right of action; and unless he is bound to refrain from an action lest an evil effect of it should follow, he in placing the cause, by doing the action, does not will, but only *permits* the evil effect. There is no affection in his will towards the evil effect, as towards an end, and where there is no such affection, the result is not willed, but only permitted.

Such permission is lawful when a cause, which is in itself good or indifferent, has two immediate effects, one of which is good, and the other of which is evil, if there is a grave reason why one should do the action which is the cause of these, and if in doing it one has a right end.

There must therefore be four conditions in order to lawful permission of an evil effect. The end of the agent in the doing of the action must be good, that is to say, he must not intend the evil effect; for otherwise that effect would be voluntary on his part. Secondly, there must be a just, or at least an indifferent, cause for the action, that is to say, the action itself must not be in opposition to any law; for this is necessary in order that the agent should have the right to do the action itself, and not sin by the doing of it. Thirdly, the effect which is good must follow at least as immediately from the action which is the cause of both effects, as does the effect which is evil. If the evil effect follows immediately from the action, and the good effect follows only mediately through the evil effect, then the action would not be lawful. It would be doing evil that good might come, and this is never lawful. Natural equity demands the avoidance of evil, and the prevention of damage to our neighbours, when we can secure this without proportionately grievous damage to ourselves or, still more, to the community; and so a proportionately grave reason is required for doing an action one of the effects of which is evil.

There is a difference between the non-voluntary and the

involuntary. The *non-voluntary* arises simply from absence of an act of will. The *involuntary* proceeds from a contrary will. The perfectly involuntary is that which is so displeasing to a deliberate will that it is not on any account willed. The will in that case resists, and efficaciously so far as depends upon it. It in no way wills to consent, and as matter of fact does not consent. There is the imperfectly involuntary when the will does not resist with all its might, or does not resist promptly and efficaciously, but languidly and with some hesitation. The truly involuntary demands that the resistance of the will should be serious, efficacious, and persevering, and that consent should be entirely excluded.

## 6.

With regard to sins of omission, when one gives, or determines to give, cause to an omission of a duty in the future, the sin of omission is then and there interiorly committed. He who wills to omit later on commits the sin in that moment in which he has this will. The external omission of the duty takes place when the time comes for fulfilment of the precept, and it is not fulfilled.

This subsequent external omission does not add any separate wickedness to that of the previous will to omit. It has nevertheless the name of a sin of omission, inasmuch as it is contrary to a law and is voluntary. It has properly the character of evil and a sin, because it proceeds from an evil will, as from a cause between which and it there is a real connection.

The measure of a sin of omission is to be taken from the preceding interior guilt of the will to omit. In this preceding will there may, however, be several kinds of wickedness. There may be one kind of wickedness in it from its own proper object. There may also be in it another kind of wickedness distinct from this, and as it is the cause of an omission of duty, which is an effect of it. The first kind of wickedness may be mortal, while the other is only venial, by reason of the slightness of the negligence in foreseeing the omission.

## 7.

Among those things which prevent or lessen the voluntary, there is, in the first place—ignorance. Ignorance sometimes signifies privation or absence of knowledge, and sometimes it signifies that which is contrary to knowledge. The latter is the ignorance of a perverted disposition. It occurs when one has a

habit of false principles, or a set of opinions by which he is hindered from knowledge of the truth.

Error, which takes and approves the false for the true, adds somewhat over and above ignorance. There may be ignorance without any judgment about the unknown. When there is a false judgment about the unknown, then there is, properly speaking—error. While every false judgment is an error, it is not properly an ignorance, but at most an effect of ignorance, if it proceeds therefrom. It may proceed, however, both from ignorance and from rashness in making a judgment which is not in accordance with the knowledge from which a right judgment might have been formed.

It is not every ignorance which is sinful. It is not sinful not to know those things which one is not bound to know. One is bound to know those things without a knowledge of which one cannot rightly do an act which one is bound to do. Hence all are bound to know the articles of faith and the precepts of universal law. Individuals are also bound to know those things which belong to their state and office.

Since ignorance—including inconsideration, inadvertence, and forgetfulness—may be vincible or invincible, error may be voluntary or involuntary.

There are two ways in which one may be invincibly ignorant. The first is when the thought of inquiry into the truth of a matter does not occur to one's mind, or when, even if it does occur, it is not of such a kind as to make one think there and then that he is bound to inquire. This is most properly invincible ignorance. Another way in which one may be invincibly ignorant, is when, suspecting his ignorance concerning something which he is bound to know, he uses moral diligence, that is to say, such diligence as is fairly within his power, and such as the importance of the matter demands, and nevertheless he does not succeed in dispelling his ignorance. Moral diligence does not mean all possible diligence, but such diligence as is usually exercised by prudent persons. It is to be measured not only by the importance of the matter, but also by the qualities and opportunities of the person, since all have not the same capacity, or the same means for learning within their reach.

The ignorance of one who wills to remain ignorant, in order that he may have an excuse for doing something which he suspects may be a sin, or in order that he may not be restrained by further knowledge in his pursuit of sin, is called *affected* ignorance. Such ignorance is clearly voluntary.

Ignorance does not excuse when it is either directly or indirectly voluntary. It is directly voluntary, when one studiously wills not to know, in order that he may the more freely sin. It is indirectly voluntary when by reason of the trouble of inquiry, or through pressure of other occupations, one neglects to learn that which would have hindered him from sinning.

Affected ignorance is not simulated or pretended ignorance. It is a real ignorance which has been studiously sought. Ignorance is not affected when one does not use diligence to inquire farther for this reason, that he thinks that he has already sufficient knowledge of the matter. He may in so judging be guilty of error, for which he is responsible by reason of previous negligence, but his ignorance is not affected. Vincible ignorance is called *crass* ignorance when there has been no effort, or scarcely any effort, to inquire or learn. When this crass ignorance is long continued, there is said to be *supine* ignorance.

There is less of the *voluntary* in crass and supine ignorance than there is in affected ignorance. It may, however, suffice for grievous sin, while even affected ignorance may be in some cases a smaller sin.

The gravity of the obligation to learn is to be weighed by the standard either of the gravity of the positive precept by which one is bound to learn, or the gravity of the matter in itself. This will be the case when absence of knowledge may entail grave evils, as, for example, in the practice of a physician or confessor, who is bound to have at least sufficient knowledge of his profession.

With regard to the guilt of sins which are done through ignorance, such sins belong to the class of sins which are voluntary—only in their cause. The guilt of them is that which there was in the placing of the cause. It is derived therefrom, and it is measured by the voluntariness that there was therein. It is contracted—like the guilt of all sins which are sinful in the cause of them—not then when the effect follows, but then when the cause was sinfully placed. It is then contracted even if from circumstances the effect does not follow. Hence confessors, physicians, advocates, and judges are equally guilty if they labour under culpable ignorance, whether losses result or not.

One who remains culpably ignorant of those things which he is bound to know, remains in a habitual state of the same sin. His case is similar to that of one who has not made

restitution, or to that of one who does not satisfy an obligation under the pressure of which he continues to live. There is not, however, in him a continuousness of *actually* sinning. He sins actually only so often as he voluntarily either formally or virtually wills to be ignorant. This he does whenever a fitting occasion of learning or inquiry offers itself to him, and he adverts to his being bound thus to dispel his ignorance, and he nevertheless there and then neglects to learn, or to resolve to learn.

When through repentance the guilt of a culpable ignorance is gone, the ignorance which remains is merely a material sin. It has the name of sin, since an ignorance which is contrary to a precept is in itself objectively evil, as is every omission of an act which has been prescribed.

## 8.

Another thing which prevents or lessens the *voluntary* in an act is—a movement of the sensual appetite. By this appetite a man is, by reason of his animal nature, inclined towards the seeking of some sensual good—which is apprehended by means of the imagination. The seeking of some sensual good includes avoidance of something which is unpleasant to the senses. This is called concupiscence, and it may be either antecedent or consequent. *Antecedent* concupiscence is that which is naturally excited by its object which presents itself and appeals to the senses. The animal appetite for this object rises up and anticipates all deliberation, and all action of the will. It is, therefore, not voluntary.

*Consequent* concupiscence is that which follows from a previous act of the will. It is, therefore, voluntary. Concupiscence may be consequent when the movement of the will redounds to the animal appetite. It is also consequent when one directly excites this appetite, or fosters it when already excited, as, for example, by studiously keeping the thoughts fixed on an enemy, or on injuries received, so as to excite or increase hatred or desire of revenge.

Antecedent concupiscence interferes with the judgment of the reason. It therefore lessens both merit and demerit, since both depend on a choice which proceeds from the reason. Passion clouds and sometimes fetters the judgment of the reason, and consequently diminishes the voluntary element in an act. If it is a sinful act, its sinfulness is thereby lessened.

Since all the powers of the soul are rooted in the one essence of the soul, when one power is intense in its own action, another power must be remiss, and may even be wholly hindered in its action. When, therefore, a movement of the animal appetite is intense, the movement of the rational appetite, or deliberate will, is correspondingly affected, and is lessened, if not wholly prevented. Passion concerns and concentrates itself upon, not the universal, but a particular object. Knowledge concerns the universal, and knowledge of the universal is not the principle of any act. It is the principle of an act only as it is applied to that particular act. When a passion is intense it repels the contrary movement of knowledge with regard to the same particular act.

When any one of the passions is very intense, a man sometimes wholly loses the use of reason, during the continuance of that intensity. When this is the case, there is no judgment of the reason. There is, therefore, no voluntary element in the act. In the act there is consequently no moral value, or sinfulness. If this concupiscence was voluntary, having been the consequence of a previous act of the will which excited it, the sin in the act will be voluntary—in its cause. If the concupiscence was not voluntary, but natural and spontaneous, as are movements of the animal appetite in those creatures which are merely animal, the subsequent act will not be voluntary, and so there will not be in it any sinfulness.

In any case, when passion diminishes the exercise of judgment, and consequently diminishes the voluntary to the same extent, the sinfulness or moral value of the act is diminished in proportion to the vehemence of the passion.

The principle of the voluntary is in the agent, and in him it is his deliberate will. The more this interior principle is active, the more grievous the sin is which is willed. The more an exterior principle is active, the less the sin is, since there is in it less of the voluntary element. It is less willed, and less deliberately willed. Passion is a principle which is extrinsic to the will itself, while the deliberate movement of the will itself is an intrinsic principle, than which there cannot be any principle which is more intrinsic. The stronger therefore the deliberate will is in its movement towards the sinful act, the greater the sin is. The stronger the passion is which gives impulse to the will towards the sinful act, the less the sin is.

Consequent concupiscence, or a movement of concupiscence



which is consequent on a previous act of will, does not diminish sin. The act of will preceded the act of concupiscence as a cause precedes its effect. When that act of will was sinful, sin preceded the movement of concupiscence. The sin was already perfected before that movement of the animal appetite arose. In this movement itself there is no sin. It belongs to human nature, and was implanted in it and ordained by the Author of nature. The evil that may be in it is derived to it from an evil will, and it is this already existing evil which is now, and by means of it, made manifest. The movement of the animal appetite is a sign of the intensity of the will, which excited it, towards the act of sin.

When the movement has not been studiously excited, and is only indirectly voluntary, through negligence in repressing spontaneous or naturally excited movements, the guilt is similar in its character to the guilt of one who through negligence is culpably ignorant of those things which he is bound to know.

Sometimes the dominion of the will is complete, and sometimes it is incomplete. It is complete in those acts which are caused by command of the will, and which follow deliberation of the reason. It is incomplete in those acts which do not proceed from a dictate of the reason, but which nevertheless the will has power to prevent. They are so far subject to the mastery of the will that the will can hinder or not hinder them. The inordination in those acts is therefore sinful, but, being incompletely voluntary, the sin is venial.

The very first movements of the animal appetites have nothing of sin in them. There begins to be sin only when the will can and does not resist in obedience to a law. When the will begins to resist, the man merits.

In relation to unlawful movements of the animal appetite, the reason and the will may be either resisting—prescribing—or not hindering. When the deliberate will resists with displeasure, and effort to repress, there is then no sin in these movements. When it prescribes or excites them as of set purpose, the sin is mortal, if the disobedience to the law is mortal of its kind. When the deliberate will can, and does not resist the unlawful movement, there is venial sin. There must be some sin, since one is held to do that which he does not hinder, when it is in his power to hinder that which is contrary to a law.

## 9.

A third thing which prevents or lessens the voluntary element in an act is—force. There is force when one is compelled by some agent, so that he cannot do the contrary of his act. This is that necessity which is called necessity of coercion. In order to the existence of coercion through force, it is required, in the first place, that the principle of action, or that which moves towards the act, should be outside the agent. It is also required that he who is compelled to act, or is forcibly prevented from acting, should not only not contribute in any way to the external principle of action, but should resist and strive against it with all the forces at his command.

Coercion is absolute when in spite of every effort the force cannot be repelled. The coercion is not absolute, but is only partial, when it is possible to break the force, or at least to weaken it. The coercion is in that case suffered not wholly without will.

It is impossible for coercion to fall on elicited acts of the will, that is to say, on acts which proceed immediately from the will itself, as these are distinguished from acts which proceed from human powers other than the will, at the command of the will. A thing cannot be at one and the same time both compelled and voluntary, and all elicited acts of the will are supremely voluntary.

Coercion can fall on acts which have been commanded by the will, and are exercised through other human powers. Acts of internal human powers are not, as regards that particular power by which they are exercised, the subjects of coercion. They are not contrary to the inclination of that power. They are not, moreover, done from any principle which is extrinsic to that power. They are in conformity with the natural appetite by which that power is inclined towards its acts. These acts are coerced or forced *morally*, or as regards the will. The will is unwilling and resists, while the acts themselves proceed naturally and spontaneously from their own powers.

Absolute force destroys the voluntary element in an act, nay, it causes the involuntary, since violence is directly opposed to the voluntary, as it is also to the natural and spontaneous.

Incomplete or partial coercion does not wholly destroy the voluntary, but it more or less diminishes it. The less the impetus of the violence, and so the easier the resistance to it,

the less involuntary, or the more voluntary, the suffering of it will be. It will be less voluntary, the greater and stronger the force is, and the more difficult it is to repel.

It may be that one is able to resist the force in itself, and that with the opposing forces which he has at his command, while he is at the same time deterred from exerting these forces on account of consequences. In this case his consent is given more from fear than from force.

When one suffers, but not unwillingly, force which is absolutely invincible, there is in him the voluntary. Although he does not contribute to the act by action, he contributes by willing to suffer the force which results in it.

## 10.

A fourth thing which affects the voluntary element in an act, is—fear. Force affects the body, and also those powers of the soul which are not the will. Fear affects the will. Slight fear is the dread of some slight danger, or if it is a dread of a great danger, it is of a danger which does not seem to be impending. Grievous fear is the dread which springs from a certain, or at least reasonable and prudent expectation of some great evil which appears to be imminent either to oneself or to one's own. It is such a fear as affects a constant man. Absolutely grievous fear is that which arises from the nature of the dreaded evil in itself. Fear may also be relatively grievous from the individual character of the person who is afraid. There are many evils which do not, as a rule, disturb a constant man which would very grievously disturb one whose character is less strong, or who is more given to imagination and credulity.

A man is then compelled by fear when he does something which, if he were free from this fear, he would not do, and when he does it in order to avoid an evil which he dreads.

A constant man differs from an inconstant man as regards the kind of danger which may be feared. The constant man always follows right reason, and knows what ought to be done or left undone. Since it is always the less evil or the greater good that ought to be chosen, the constant man is borne towards the bearing of a less evil by the fear of a greater evil. He is not compelled to the doing of a greater evil for the avoidance of a less evil, as the inconstant man is. The constant man cannot, for example, be compelled to sin by fear of bodily

suffering, since the greatest bodily suffering is a less evil than is the least sin. A pertinacious man is one who cannot be compelled to the doing of even a less evil for the avoidance of a greater evil. The constant man stands therefore midway between the inconstant man and the pertinacious man.

The constant man differs from the inconstant man also in his esteem of the danger which is imminent. The constant man is compelled only by a strong case, while the inconstant man is compelled by a weak case. The constant man is an intrepid man, not that he is not open to fear, but he does not fear what, or where, or when he ought not to fear.

The dread of offending, or losing the approbation of those whom, by reason of their condition, one ought to love or reverence, such as parents, masters, or other superiors, is called reverential fear. This also may be either slight or grievous.

Intrinsic fear may arise from infirmity of either soul or body. Those who are suffering in body are more prone to fear. Fear which is induced by the progress of disease, or by the approach of death, is intrinsic, inasmuch as the cause of it is within the man himself who has the fear. Extrinsic fear is that which has an extrinsic cause in some person or thing outside the man himself who fears. Even in him who is affected by this extrinsic fear there may, however, be also an intrinsic fear, as far as regards the excess of fear in him over and above that fear which the extrinsic cause is calculated to produce.

Fear caused by man may be either simply the reason why one wills a thing, or it may be directed towards extorting assent. In the first case, the consent is not extorted; in the second, it is directly extorted by the fear.

Those things which are done from fear, induced either by a natural cause, or by some person as a cause, are in themselves, and as a rule, *absolutely* or simply *voluntary*. To the merchant who casts his cargo into the sea to save his ship, *knowledge* is not wanting, nor is *will* wanting. Loving his life better than his goods, he *wills* to throw them overboard.

Acts which are done from fear may be partially involuntary, since that which is done from fear alone is not in itself pleasing to the will. It is not eligible. It is not chosen because it is pleasing. It is merely *allowed* for the avoidance of a greater evil. If this greater evil had not impelled towards it, the will would never have inclined towards it. In this case it is not the fear which properly causes the involuntary. It is the affection

towards the object abandoned, which would not have been abandoned except through terror of a greater evil.

An evil deed done from fear is in a manner more pardonable, and the evil-doer is condemned more as weak than as wicked. If fear should wholly obliterate all use of reason, the act will not be voluntary. Even if the fear should only very much disturb the reason, the act will, in virtue of this hindrance, in so far fall short of its voluntary element.

## II.

The liberty or freedom which is necessary in order that the acts of a man should truly and properly be *human* acts, and have a *moral* value, is a faculty of the soul which—given all things which are required in order to acting—has it in its power either to act or not to act. If any of these requisites for action is absent, the omission of the act is due, not to the free choice of the will, but to the impossibility of acting. If with all the requisites for acting, a man had not the power not to act, his act would be necessary, and—not free.

Human acts are *moral* acts from their relation to the rule of morality or rightness. This rule of rightness is wider than is law. Law does not prescribe everything which is right in itself. There are many good acts which are not prescribed. This of course supposes the fact that in a sense or way all acts fall under law. Even as regards right actions which have not been prescribed, but which one spontaneously wills to do, law prescribes that these should be done in accordance with the standard of reason.

The *material* goodness of an act is its accordance with the rule of rightness, without regard had to the agent. Its *formal* goodness has regard to the agent, and is—its conformity with the rule of rightness, as the act proceeds from the free-will of the agent, and with his previous knowledge of that rule.

The elements and principles of a moral act, or those sources from which morality flows to a human act, are—the object of that act—its circumstances—and its end.

The *object* of an act is that with regard to which the will is concerned, as it is the matter of the act, and towards which the will primarily tends. The circumstances of the act are also set before the mind, but towards them the will does not primarily tend. If it did, they also would form an object of the act.

The *material object* of a moral act is that—whatever it may be, whether thing or action—with regard to which the act is concerned. Its *formal object* is the same, but as it is subject to the rule of rightness, as regards the agent, or, as with advertence by the agent to the rule of rightness, the action is knowingly and freely done by him.

The object is in itself or objectively good or evil, as it is in accordance or in disagreement with the rule of rightness. If it has not in it anything whatever which belongs to the order of reason, that is to say, anything in virtue of which it is reasonably sought after, or reasonably avoided, then it is—indifferent, and neither good nor evil.

Some things are good, not inasmuch as they have been prescribed, but they are prescribed because they are good, and that inasmuch as they are in accordance with necessary order. Some things are evil, not inasmuch as they have been forbidden, but they are forbidden because they are evil, inasmuch as they are opposed to that necessary order which springs from the nature of things. The things thus prescribed and forbidden are *intrinsically* good and evil. Those things which, being indifferent in themselves, and neither good nor evil, become good because they have been prescribed, or evil because they have been forbidden, are said to be *extrinsically* good or evil.

There is one order which has its foundation in the nature of things, and which God Himself cannot alter. There is another order which is subject to the Divine dominion, and which, since it is not absolutely necessary, God can change. Thus the evil in taking away the life or the property of another ceases, if right to take them has been given by God.

The *end* of an act is that by reason of which the act is done. The end is really included among the circumstances of the act. On account, however, of the principal place which the end of an act holds in morals, it is usually treated separately.

Not only the means towards the end are subject to the end, but the object of the act, when that object holds the place of a means, is also subject to the end of the act.

The end of the act is proximately intended by the agent, and it is the formal object or scope to which the act in itself tends. Besides the end of an act in itself, there is also the end of the agent. This is superadded by the agent, when he adopts the act as a means towards the attainment of some end which



he has in view. The two ends are identified when the agent has no end in contemplation which differs from the end of the act itself. Several ends may be superadded to the same act, when the end of the agent differs from the end of that act. He may take to an object which is in itself formally intended for some other end, and in so doing that end is sometimes entirely set aside by him.

The objective end is—the thing which one aims at getting through the object as it is a means. The formal end is—the attainment and possession of the objective end. An ultimate or last end is—that end which is not itself ordained towards any other end. It is simply an end, and is in no way a means, as is an end which is ordained towards another end. Such an end is not only an end, but it is also itself a means. An end may be the last in a series, but if it is ordained towards some other end outside this series, it is said to be only partially or intermediately a last end. A positively last end is an end which either in itself, or of the intention of the agent, excludes any ulterior end. An end which is not actually ordained as a means towards another end, but which is capable of being so ordained, is called a negatively last end. Of this we have an example in acts of virtues, other than charity, which are capable of being ordained, but are not actually ordained towards the ulterior and nobler end of charity.

A primary end is an end which not merely has the first place, but which is of itself sufficient to move the agent towards the act. The primary end may be manifold. There may be several ends of an act, any one of which is in itself sufficient to move the agent to the doing of that act. Hence a primary end is distinguished from an end which is the total cause of an act. When an end is the only and complete reason for an act, it is said to be the total cause of that act—by totality of cause. When the whole of the act depends from one end, but might have equally depended from another end, the end from which it actually depends is said to be its total cause—by totality of effect.

A *secondary* end of an act merely *impels* towards that act, along with another end.

By the *circumstances* of a human act are to be understood any conditions which are outside the substance of the act, but which are nevertheless in some way in touch with the act itself.

The circumstances of an act suppose the act as already constituted in its nature, and as having its species from the object to which it tends. Hence the circumstances of human acts are called *accidents* of those acts. As accidents give to their substance some perfection, or lessen its perfection, so do circumstances to the acts of which they are the circumstances. The circumstances of human acts may be reduced to seven, and these are indicated by the interrogative words Who?—What?—Where?—By what aids?—Why?—How?—When?

*Who?* denotes not an individual as such, but a man of a particular class or state, cleric or layman—married or single, or bound by vow. *What?* regards the accidental quantity or quality of the object, or effects which follow. *Where?* refers to the character of the place in which the act is done, except in the case when from the character of the place the whole of the substance of the act or sin is derived. *By what aids?* has regard to the instrumental cause, or to the means used. *Why?* indicates an extrinsic end. *How?* has reference to the mode of the act, and also to full or partial advertence, a right or erroneous conscience, the remissness or intensity of the act, and force used in the doing of it. *When?* refers to the circumstance of time, and may refer either to the duration of the action, or to a circumstance which is extrinsic to the action, such as the sacredness of the time at which the act was done.

A circumstance may be in touch with the act of which it is a circumstance, either as regards the act itself, or as regards its cause, or as regards its effect, as will appear on consideration of the seven classes to which all circumstances of human acts may be reduced.

The *primary* is that which gives to a thing its *species*. A natural thing has its species from its form. An act has its species from its object. Motion has its species from its terminus, towards which it tends, and in which it ends. The primary goodness or badness of moral acts is from the object of those acts. The chief circumstance of those acts is the end or reason for which they were done.

The acts of a man are properly *human* acts, as they are voluntary, or acts which proceed from deliberate will. The motive and object of the will is the end which is set before it. Hence that is the chief of all the circumstances of an act, which is in touch with the act as regards its end, for the sake of which it is done. That is secondary which is in touch with the

substance of the act, or that which is done by the act. Other circumstances are more or less principal, as they more or less approach to these.

Circumstances produce certain effects on the acts of which they are circumstances. A *new species* is given to an act by a circumstance, when the nature of the goodness or badness which is derived from the circumstance is of a different order or species from that of the object. St. Thomas says that such a circumstance is then a specific *differentia* of the moral act, and so loses the character of a circumstance, and constitutes a species. We, however, commonly speak of certain circumstances as circumstances which *change the species* of a moral act.

This is the reason why a single sinful act may be manifold in its species. One act of sin may, for example, be contrary both to justice and to religion. To the wickedness of one order which there is in one act, a circumstance of that act may add another wickedness of a different order.

When, moreover, the sinfulness of an act, which would have been grievous by reason of the object of that act, becomes slight in virtue of a circumstance of the act; or when, on the other hand, the sinfulness of an act which is slight by reason of the object of the act, becomes grievous through a circumstance, the circumstance in either case transfers the act to another *theological* species. Theological species have reference to the grievousness or slighness of sins. *Moral* species are diversified in accordance with their various objects. Theological species may therefore have place within the same moral species, that is to say, there may be both grievous and slight sins in acts of the same species of wickedness.

The imperfection of an act as a *human* act effects a change of theological species, inasmuch as it excuses from grievous sin. So also does smallness of matter in sins which of their kind are grievous sins. These must, however, be such as may of their nature admit of smallness of matter. A sin which of its kind is slight never becomes grievous in virtue of a circumstance of the sinful act, unless when that circumstance adds a deformity of another and a grievous kind.

A man then directly intends the good, when he wills the good under its idea of the good. This is not as if reflection were necessary in the mind of the agent, but inasmuch as he

wills the good, being allured by its goodness. It matters not whence this goodness may be derived, whether from the object or from the circumstances of the act. In order to the badness of an act, on the other hand, it suffices that the badness should be *indirectly* voluntary, since one is not only bound not to will badness, but is also bound to hinder and avoid it. Recollection of this is of practical use with regard to sins of omission.

## 12.

In morals it is the object of an act which constitutes its species. This it does, not as it is in itself materially, but formally, as it is apprehended by the reason, as either good or bad. Hence a man who with deliberate will does an act which he thinks to be a sin, although erroneously, since in reality there was no sin whatever in the act, commits a sin. In the same way, when he does an act in which he thinks there is no sin, but is mistaken, since in reality there was sin, he does not by that act commit a sin.

An act which is good in virtue of its object, and which is also dictated by the will for a good end, has a two-fold goodness. Besides the essential specific goodness of the object, the act has an accidental goodness derived to it from its end. Each of those goodnesses is intended by the will, and the one does not interfere with the other. The two are compatible, and may be found in the same act. For the same reason, an act which is evil in its object will, if it is directed towards an evil end, have in it a two-fold wickedness.

An act which is indifferent as regards its object, takes its goodness or its badness from its end. An act which is either good or indifferent in itself and as regards its object, may become bad both from its end and from its circumstances. An act which is bad in itself is not made good by the goodness of its end. If an end which is only slightly evil is the *total* cause of an act which, apart from that end and in itself is materially good, this end totally vitiates that act. He who so acts wills the good under the idea of the evil, under which alone he wills the act. His will is therefore wholly evil.

When an act, of which the object is not merely materially good, but formally good, that is, good as it is apprehended by the reason, has, as the end for which it is done, an end which is slightly evil, and this end is not the total and immediate reason why the act is determined on, that act is partly good and partly

bad. Such an external act is single in its nature, as it is an act, but is manifold in the moral order. If it were single in the latter, it could not be both morally good and morally bad. An act of will which is slightly evil may be subsequent to an act of will which was previously good, and may not vitiate it. It may even precede, if it does not inform the act which reason dictates, and nevertheless not vitiate it. It is in that case so extrinsically present as to be an occasion rather than a cause of the subsequent act. Much less is an act which is not only materially but formally good in its object, corrupted if it should have something which is indifferent as its secondary end, unless that end were the total cause of the act. Neither is the goodness of an act wholly corrupted by a badness which attaches to the act accidentally through one of its circumstances. That is extrinsic to the act. It neither dictates the act, nor does it infect the will which tends towards the goodness which there is in the act. That goodness remains in the act, or at any rate it has not wholly departed from it.

## 13.

Supernatural acts are human acts which are done by a man with the aid of God's grace. This grace is supernatural, as superadded to the powers, faculties, and forces of nature. Acts which are supernatural are also in some way ordained towards the eternal salvation of those who do them. Such acts cannot be indifferent acts.

Certain acts are *morally* good, which nevertheless do not merit eternal reward, because those who do them are not in the state of grace. There are also certain acts which are *morally* good, and which nevertheless in no way merit in the supernatural order, such as the good works of infidels. Those works may please God, although they are not meritorious of supernatural reward. Even among supernatural acts, there are some to which, although they are good, the reward of eternal life is not due. Such are acts done with the aid of actual grace by those who dispose themselves for entering or re-entering the state of habitual grace, which is that sanctifying grace which makes them holy. Acts which are not meritorious are not therefore to be confounded with acts which are evil.

There are different degrees of moral goodness, and these are so related the one to the other, that when one is subtracted the other does not thereby vanish, although the act to which it

belongs becomes less perfect. It is sufficient in order to the existence of moral goodness, that an act should be such as befits a man. There must be in it nothing which is opposed to the good which befits a man, in accordance with right reason. There should be in it no sin, either by way of excess, or by way of defect.

That man should spontaneously tend towards goods which are in accordance with his nature, he has in virtue of his nature. He is inclined towards this end by the Author of nature. The office of man's reason is to see that in so tending there should be nothing inordinate, but everything in due measure. When there is neither excess or defect, his tendency is right. Practically, therefore, that is to be reckoned good which does not appear to be evil.

If that which reason dictates is apprehended as not directly falling under precept or prohibition, it is not, when it is done, done directly contrary to the conscience, but beside the conscience. In this case a man does not sin mortally. If he sins, he sins only venially, and it may be that he does not sin at all. When, for example, his conscience dictates to a man that it would be good to do a certain work of counsel, he does not sin by not doing it. He has not apprehended it as a work which is due from him and necessary to his salvation, as it would be if it fell under precept with such an obligation and its sanction.

If the omission of a good act is simply and solely an omission, or will to omit an act which has not been prescribed, and the end of this is reasonable, the omission will be good. If the end of the omission is not reasonable, the omission will be a venial sin, not as if the act omitted had been prescribed, but because it is of precept to have in every act, and so in every omission as it is an act of will, a right end.

Every individual act must have some circumstance by which it is drawn either towards good or towards evil, at least as regards the intention of the end. Inasmuch as it belongs to the reason to ordain human acts, an act which proceeds from deliberate reason is, if it is not ordained to a due end, thereby opposed to reason. It has therefore in it the idea of evil. If it is ordained towards a due end, it is in conformity with the order of reason, and hence it has in it the idea of moral goodness. Every human act must necessarily be either ordained or not ordained towards a due end, and must therefore be either morally good or morally evil.



## 14.

It belongs to the precept of charity, whereby God should be loved with the whole heart, that all things should be referred to Him. Unless they are so referred, that precept cannot be fulfilled. In order that a human act should be meritorious of eternal reward, nothing farther is required than that the man who does it should be in the state of grace. By this is satisfied the obligation of referring all his acts to God. If he is in the state of grace, he has habitual charity, and by an act of charity he refers himself—all he has and all he is—to God. In virtue of this first act, all his subsequent human acts are sufficiently ordained towards God, so as to be meritorious of eternal reward. This they will be even if he, while doing them, is not thinking either of God or of charity. It is sufficient if his will is merely borne towards the action as it is a right action. If he does deliberately that which from right reason appears to him to be morally good, although he is not moved to acting, or directed in his action except by the motive of the rightness of that virtue which he is then exercising by, for example, an act of friendship, observance in salutation of a superior, or the like, it is sufficient. Nay, it is sufficient if he is moved to act solely by a general apprehension of moral good, and that comes to this, that in the act he does not apprehend sin.

Virtual reference of acts in the present is constituted by one act of theological charity in the past. There is no need that that act should have had explicit reference to any series of acts of the future comprehended under any particular end. All his future acts were comprehended in the man's dedication of himself to God and His service, whereby he individually and voluntarily accepted God, who is by Divine right the last end of all things, as his own last end. That ordination by him of himself and of all his acts perseveres so long as he retains the habit of charity. This he does so long as he remains in the state of that habitual grace which sanctifies or makes him holy. All the acts which he does in this state of grace remain, in virtue of that ordination in the past ordained or referred to God. The ordination continues and endures until it is retracted or excluded by a contrary act, or by a mortal sin. Until this takes place, every human act of his either is meritorious, or is at least a venial sin, and no human act of his is indifferent. Every act of his which is morally good springs from that charity which

every one has who is in the state of grace. The only good acts of a man which can be indifferent as regards merit, or be neither meritorious nor demeritorious, are the good acts of one who is not in the state of grace.

An act of any moral virtue tends towards its proper object by reason of its own rightness. It nevertheless, implicitly, and of its own nature, and without any other act, tends towards God. For this there is no need that it should be again expressly ordained towards Him.

An act is sufficiently informed by charity to be meritorious, even if it is done for the end of another virtue. Not only are acts of charity itself meritorious, but acts of other virtues also are meritorious, as they are informed by grace. They cannot be meritorious save as they are reduced to the end of charity, but there is no need that they should always be actually reduced to that end. It is sufficient to make them meritorious that they should be reduced to the ends of other virtues. Those acts tend towards that Supreme Good who is the object of charity, and all virtues are reduced to the end of charity. Charity stands related to all the other virtues as their mover—as their end—and as their form. Charity is the *mover* of the other virtues, inasmuch as the good, which is the object of charity, is the end of all virtues. Charity is the *end* of the other virtues, for the end of an inferior power or habit is ordained to the end of a superior power or habit. Hence charity is called the end of the precept. Charity is the *form* of the other virtues, and perfects every one of them in its idea as it is a virtue. An inferior power has not perfection of virtue, save as it participates in the perfection of a superior power. All virtues which are meritorious of eternal reward are in powers which are subject to the will. These participate in the perfection of the will, and the will itself is perfected by charity. Charity is, therefore, the form of all the other virtues, and it becomes their form, as it is their mover and their end.

To offer one's principal actions to God—to renew this intention several times a day, or at least at the beginning of every day—to act in every separate work from a distinct supernatural motive, and to act always from perfect, or at least initial, charity, is very excellent by way of counsel, for God's greater glory, for the greater perfection of our works, and for their more abundant merit; but it is in no way of precept. Then only are men bound to re-dedicate themselves, and by that act to refer

all that is theirs to the glory of God, when the obligation presses upon them of eliciting an act of charity itself. The law of referring one's works to God is not more binding than is the precept of charity. This truth of the sufficiency of one act of will which issues in an act of charity displays in clearest light the fact that the will, that noblest of human powers, is stable in its operation. It is not volatile, nor does it vacillate. It is not moved without a motive. Its intention is not interrupted, nor does it evaporate or evanesce through lapse of time. When the will is once set in one direction, it remains so set, until from a motive of equal efficacy it turns itself away.

From our analysis of human acts we discern the measure of human responsibility. The central standpoint is the truth that all morality is in the deliberate will. All sin is rooted in, and springs from the will. There is no such thing as a sin of imagination, or a sin of thought. The sin is in the willing to imagine or to think. A man cannot deliberately will to imagine or to think without his knowing, and with certainty, that he is so willing, and that he has so willed. In the absence of this certainty, he has the comfort of believing, and with solid reason, that whatever may have been his frailty, he has not set his will in opposition to the will of Him who made him. He has a right to that peace which belongs to men of good-will.

WILLIAM HUMPHREY.

## *A Mixed Marriage.*

---

### THE THIRD PHASE.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE GREAT CALM.

BUT little can be recorded of the years that followed ; all that can be attempted is to show by a few milestones how it fared with those two whose lives have been traced. Chapters can be filled with the description of a storm and the havoc it causes, while a few paragraphs exhaust the calm which succeeds it.

It is true that a great calm fell over the lives of Humphrey and his wife ; and each year found them growing more together, and happier in the love and trust of each other. Be it said that Margaret was the chief author of the calm, of which he was the chief recipient and enjoyer.

The talk she had had with her husband after their reconciliation had troubled her very much, and she was deeply impressed by the difficulties which lay in the way, and which, petty though they might be, would be enough to prevent their life together being as harmonious and cloudless as, seeing their attachment to each other, it ought to be. Looking at her life now in a different way to what she had ever done before, being no longer able to enjoy it like a butterfly, or shrink from it like a craven, it seemed to her that the only means of stemming her way through the difficulties of her dual life was to obliterate herself, and to put entirely on one side her own desires, her own joys, her own interests as a Catholic, in every point where there was no question of right and wrong to be considered. In this she may not have been doing justice to herself, but it was a course which her naturally unselfish nature made easy to her.

As for Humphrey, under the influence of this calm the past was, as it were, wiped from his memory, and his jealous nature, growing may be less jealous as he advanced in middle life, found no food on which to feed itself, and he found married life

a thoroughly satisfactory arrangement. No dark cloud hung lowering over their happiness, though Margaret knew very well that it might be only below the horizon.

All circumstances conduced to favour this peaceful phase of life. The future fate of both children was settled, apparently beyond dispute, so nothing threatened in that quarter.

Humphrey's interests, moreover, widened every year beyond the narrow limits of his home, and while in them he sought for and obtained his wife's ready sympathy and valuable help more than ever before, he got to require less that she should be interiorly than exteriorly one with him.

It might very well be that no practices of his wife's religion obtruded themselves disagreeably on him, or interfered with the selfish harmony of his life, for, poor soul, as far as the external observances and comforts of her religion were concerned, she was living on next door to starvation rations. Living three miles from her church, her drive there on Sundays in the Alne Court carriage, which had roused such opposite feelings in the breasts of old Lady Alne and Mrs. Munro, was all she had to live on. Any idea of going there on a week-day she abandoned after one attempt, though that one attempt she did make. Knowing that she had carriages and horses in abundance at her beck and call, and that she could, unchallenged, use them for the most eccentric purposes and at the most eccentric times, she thought she would try whether she could not use them in the one way she would most value them, by making them take her to Mass on other days besides Sundays.

The first attempt brought ominous symptoms of gathering in the old black cloud, and Humphrey's temper got a touch of its old acerbity as he talked about the nuisance of his own and everybody else's arrangements being upset by a fad; about life being made unbearable; and that she could not be a man's wife and a nun at the same time; and other nonsense of the sort. Altogether Margaret's life was made unpleasant to her for a few days.

Humphrey was a man who would put himself out a good deal, and really take a great deal of trouble to give pleasure to his wife, but he liked to do it in his own way, and that the pleasure given should be of his own choosing. But the fact is, that though a selfish dislike to any change in the daily routine of his life, even to a slight change in the hour of breakfast, had something to do with his objections, it was but little. His old

suspicious nature slumbered, but it was not dead ; and far from realizing of what a very ordinary kind and degree was the piety evinced by his wife in her modest desire for an occasional week-day Mass, he read it to mean that she wished to launch out into pious extremes and eccentricities, which, if he did not nip them in the bud, might develope into he knew not what. Perhaps the time might come, if he gave her her head too much with these foolish notions, when she would get to consider every sort of extravagance right. She might even get to think that she had no right to be his wife, and might leave him and shut herself up in a convent, as, surely, he had read that women used to do in the middle ages ! It was wiser to stop the folly in its beginning, and put his foot down before it grew.

His was the folly ! Poor Humphrey, once he let that demon of suspicion govern him, there was no limit to the folly of his thoughts !

History repeats itself. The Roman Emperors of old used to butcher their Christian soldiers, assuming that, though apparently the very pick of their legions, they must be traitors because they were Christians ; refusing to see that it was because they were Christians that they were the best soldiers. So Humphrey indulged in suspicions and forebodings of the probable evil effects of her religion on his wife, utterly refusing to see that it was the religion whose effects he dreaded which made her so very precious to him as she was.

If he could only have seen Margaret's life as it was, and not as he saw it, distorted through his own glasses, and seen how far happier and easier her life, month after month, at Alne Court would have been for even an attempt at daily Mass, which is to the Catholic in the world as the daily bread of his soul, he would have acted differently. But he could not be expected to see it, and she, as it was in her nature to do, of course gave in, being unmindful in her unselfishness that self-abnegation is not always a virtue, and that our duty to ourselves often bids us assert our own interests, when we would gladly renounce them for the pleasure of another.

But she who was so made by nature to depend on others in her joys and sorrows, was very lonely. Peaceful as was her present life in all externals, cloudless as was her intercourse with her husband, tenderly as she loved him and rejoiced in his love, it was now that for the first time she discovered how lonely her married life was.



Margaret had come out of her troubles, and out of those dark days, when she had so freely toyed with evil on the brink of the abyss, a very different woman to what she had been when she went in. Adversity had bred a new strength in her. Every part of her was stronger: her power to bear was stronger; her power to love was stronger; and, above all, her power to believe was stronger.

The faith in which she had been almost born, which she had taken as such a matter of course in her bright, early days, which she had held so cheap when she married, but which had, almost unbeknown to herself, made her a better woman than she would otherwise have been in the light days which followed; the faith which had caused her whatever suffering she had known; the faith which, stronger than herself, had kept her from ruin the two last years, and which had finally enabled her to cast the spirit of evil behind her—that faith she now clung to with a love strong as death. And now, when her outward life was cloudless, when she might have fearlessly basked in her husband's love and confidence, when her life and his were daily getting more welded into one, and he was as indispensable to her as she was to him, now for the first time she felt in its full force the bitter pain of being separated from him whom she loved, in all that made the real happiness of her God-made soul. They were in reality farther apart than they had ever been before.

Margaret knew that she herself had grown in faith, and her love for her husband told her that he had equally grown in unfaith. She knew it, though he never spoke to her about it, having a chivalrous, though conventional, fear lest he should tarnish her faith by speaking.

There was a time when she had not felt so far from him, careless and unthinking of God and the things of God as he had been in those days. She had known that it was scarcely ever that he thought enough about God to pray to Him, but she had also known that in times of emergency he could pray like a little child, shedding in the moment of peril all the Godless years of his life, and becoming again what he had, perhaps, been when he knelt and learnt to pray at his mother's knee.

How well she remembered one day when Arnold, as a baby, lay dangerously ill of some infantine complaint, finding her husband in his room, on his knees, praying for the child's life,

and how he had sprung to his feet, confused that she should have caught him! But now she knew that wife, mother, children, might lie in deadly peril, and never a prayer would pass his lips. She knew, though he told her nothing, that the God in whom he believed was one whom he dared not know, to whom it would be impossible to speak, a God who has no will about us, to whom our sins are not abhorrent, a God at whose feet it would be childish to ask pardon.

So these two, one in the sight of man, and still more one in the sight of God, though they lived as one in the sight of man, lived as two in the sight of God and His angels. Humphrey, ever more and more disconnecting his wife's religion from the Church which he disliked and distrusted, liked it in her as part of her and as well suiting her, and suffered nothing from this mode of separation; but to Margaret the suffering was growing so acute that she did not dare look it in the face.

And Arnold—what about him?

The arrangement proposed by his mother was carried out. She left her home whenever her boy returned to it, but more often he spent his holidays, as he used to do, with his father at his aunt's house. Lord Alne minded the sight of his wife packing up her things and going more than she herself minded going.

By degrees he took to bringing the boy home, first for a day or two, and then for a week or more. Margaret felt she was under supervision the whole time, but her husband need have had no fear: Arnold and his mother were strangers to each other. She was almost shy with him, and he—well, not shy with her, for that might have been overcome, but ill at ease, and bored with her as if she were a stranger. So when one mid-summer, after the boy had been a year at Eton, his father announced to Margaret that he would spend his next holidays altogether at home, and hoped that he would always be able to do so for the future, she scarcely felt glad; and she knew but too well that Humphrey would never have proposed such a thing had he not felt that it was "safe."

Pleasure in her boy Margaret had none, except that no mother could be quite unstirred by the sight of his bright, handsome face and open boyish ways; but she saw very little of him. He was out all day with his gun or his rod, or boating, or cricketing, or else in the stables or with the keeper. She

knew that he kept away more than he need do, and in fact he never came near her if he could help it, having, as has been said, a feeling of want of ease with her, and being too essentially selfish to try to overcome it. So of actual pleasure she had none; of pain she had a fair share.

She had not thought that her son was to be that sort of boy, or to be a man such as he seemed likely to grow into; only pleasure seeking, only selfish; not putting himself to any inconvenience for any one, contemptuous to his sister, uncaring for herself, free and easy with his father with sometimes a nineteenth century impertinence. And yet, perhaps, she was too hard to please, for with his bright handsome looks, and his open, manly ways, there was not a person in the neighbourhood, not a dependent on the estate, who did not say that he was the very picture of a noble English boy!

His mother pondered much about his future, and wondered how much capacity for good he had in him, how much for evil, realizing all too well that he was her son, and that but for her he would never have existed. It was pain to think how powerless she was to help him in things either great or small. Of great things there were none yet, but of small ones there were not a few. Among these small things (and not so very small either) in which she yearned to help him, were the frequent quarrels he had with his father. Lord Alne was very proud of his son, but all the same the boy's ways aggravated him, and many a painful scene took place between them, hot temper pitted against hot temper, strong will against strong will, in which the boy gave back as hot as he received. Poor Margaret would sit by helplessly during these quarrels, seeing the evil, but knowing that she could do nothing, and knowing that her boy was smarting the more because of her presence, being mortified at the idea of the scene taking place before one who was almost as a stranger. And when the scene was over, and Arnold was left vanquished and angry, though his mother was there yearning to do for his poor sore heart all that only his mother could do, he never thought of turning to her, but fled to soothe his wounded feelings in the stables or at the kennels.

## CHAPTER II.

## IN THE PRESENCE OF DEATH.

IT was after the first holidays which Arnold spent at home, that old Lady Alne died, full of years and benedictions from many a society. Her children and her children-in-law were gathered round her, for the course of her illness had given time for them to be summoned to her side.

The end came, and all her children, her four daughters, her much loved son, and Margaret, were round her dying bed, while the four sons-in-law sat ill at ease in the adjoining room, having no special love for her who was dying, and feeling themselves out of place near her death-bed, yet not thinking it right or decent to be further away.

The best and the worst that Humphrey's mother could do were done, for her life was virtually at an end. She had lain for days wrapped in deep unconsciousness, from which state of oblivion it was not likely that she would awake till she opened her eyes in the other world, with all the surprises which it had in store for her.

Her daughters stood around her bed, and ministered to her bodily wants, trying with fans, and scents, and soothing applications to relieve her last discomforts.

Humphrey sat motionless and miserable by her side, holding her limp, shrivelled hand in his, sensible that it was his right to be in the place nearest to her, a right which not one of his sisters disputed with him.

Margaret alone knelt and prayed with all her soul for her who might at any moment be called to make that plunge about which we know so little—and yet about which we know so much. She knew that her mother-in-law had done much to set her husband against her religion, and she knew that had it not been for her very likely Arnold would not be as he was; but of course all this was forgotten now. She only knew that the mother who was so dear to him whom she herself loved dearest of all on earth was dying, and in need of help; that he, her husband, could not pray for her, so that she, his wife, must do it for him.

So she knelt and prayed; and after the last long shuddering sigh had been given, and one by one her children stole away,

for "all was over," and the more they had loved her the more they hated the sight of her dead clay, Margaret remained and prayed, knowing that she was now able to show her love for her husband, and do for him as she had never done before.

The funeral was over. Lady Alne's remains had been laid to rest by her husband's side in the family vault at Alne Court. Sisters, and brothers-in-law, and nephews, and cousins were gone, and Humphrey and his wife were once more alone, sitting in his room in the deepening twilight, for the servants felt instinctively that they had better not enter to disturb the two by closing the shutters and taking in the lamps.

"My Margaret," he said at last, and they were the first real words he had had leisure to speak to her on that sad day. "I liked to see you pray as my dear mother lay dying. I wished I could do so too, but I liked to see you doing it for both of us."

"Oh, Humphrey," she replied, going up to him and kneeling by his chair, speaking with a self-forgetfulness bred of the time they had been living through, "oh, how I wish you were what I am, and that you had all that I have got."

"It is no earthly good your trying to convert me," he replied a little sadly, but with enough acerbity to make his wife shrink into herself and rise to her feet. With gentle force he drew her back again to his side.

"It is no use, my Margaret," he continued, putting his arm round her so that she had to lay her still fair head on his shoulder; "though if any body could make me a Catholic it would be you. It is not many men who are blessed with a wife like you, my Margaret. You are happy in your faith, and I would not have you otherwise than you are, and I think that I have got to be happy that our Gertrude should have learnt her faith from her mother instead of want of faith from her father. I want you to believe, dearest, and when I get wound up, as I have been lately, I feel glad of your belief. It is this that makes me chary of letting you know what my beliefs really are, for I should fear to shake all that you hold most precious.

"For you don't think, do you, Margaret, that a man can grow up believing what he was taught as a child? You don't think that dearly as I loved my mother, I could be as she was? There must come a time, sooner or later, when a man must think for himself; when, as part of his nature, he must try and weigh in the balance all that has been taught as true to himself,

and all that has been taught as true to the world ; and of his very honesty cast from him all that his inner soul tells him is not true. And somehow that which is left to him does not always make him a happy man. When it comes to death and dying, he craves for more and envies those who have it. I have never liked to talk like this before, for I know what you feel about faith, and did not want to distress you. But, somehow, when I saw you praying by my mother's side—well, as I do not think even she ever prayed—I longed to talk to you soul to soul, for I want you to pray for me in the same way."

Margaret's heart smiled, if her lips did not. What had she done, what did she ever do but pray for him ?

"There was a time," he continued, "some years ago when I thought and wondered whether I could ever be as you are ; but what does not come to a man he cannot do. I cannot trust your Church. No ! do not mind what I am saying. Perhaps it is that I have known you, but anyhow I do not think I have the bad opinion of Catholics that I used to have. I dare say there are lots of bad hats among them as there are everywhere else, but I do not care if there are, and it is not that which influences me in my opinion. But I never *could* give my assent to such a system as a whole as your Church is. My soul could not endure that the Church should stand between me and God ; that He must speak to me through it, that it should be to me the infallible oracle of what I am to believe, and what I am to do, and that I must receive the good things of God through what you call your sacraments. My soul and what I feel to be my higher nature recoil from what are the very foundations of your creed, and I say all this, my Margaret, to prove to you what an unpromising convert I should make. But I own that yours is the only really Christian creed which will hold water. I could not go on as I was brought up, and as my dear mother believed. That and every other form crumble at the first touch."

There was a long pause. Margaret did not speak, finding it hard to give words to the thoughts that bubbled up within her. She had an uncomfortable feeling that that which made Humphrey's soul recoil from God's appointed means of grace was, alas, but too nearly akin to that which made Satan fall as lightning from Heaven. She longed indeed for the tongues of men and of angels to say all that she knew there was to be said ; but had she possessed the golden speech of a St. Chrysostom,



it would probably have availed no more than the silence which, in her helplessness, she maintained.

He went on at last: "So you who believe so firmly, you do not know what it is to be at sea, and rudderless. A man can be content not to know what he believes when all goes well, and he feels glad of the honesty which refuses to let him say or think he believes one jot more than he does. But when it comes to dying and death, when he sees one whom he loves, who gave him birth, who has formed such a long and large part of his life ever since he existed—sees her going somewhere, he knows not where, whether to nothingness or to God, he feels a chill darkness such as you cannot understand. And I cannot keep silence; I must speak what is in my heart to you who are, as it were, part of myself. But now, if you do not mind, we will say no more."

That time, and that time only, when reserve had melted because they had stood together in the presence of death, did Humphrey lift the veil from what was hidden in his soul. Margaret had guessed what was there; but now that she knew it she felt as if she could scarcely bear the thoughts of the empty gulf, looking into which he whom she loved lived, and was generally content to live.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### ARNOLD.

ARNOLD was eighteen and had just come home from Eton for the last time, his future career being still in abeyance.

The house at Alne Court was filled with company for a shooting-party. Lord Alne had been out shooting all day, and Margaret had been busy entertaining her lady friends. Now five o'clock tea was over; the female portion of the company had betaken themselves to their own rooms, and the men were disposed of, so Humphrey and his wife were sitting together in her little sitting-room, where he always preferred being to anywhere else, and were now able to snatch an hour or so's recreation after their social labours, for the task of entertaining their friends was not a very congenial one to either of these two.

Arnold had arrived home only two days before, and his parents had not had much time to talk about him.

"I am not sorry the boy has done with Eton," said his father. "I don't think it is what it was in my day. I think now they let a boy be a man before his time. I remember that I was quite a boy when I was eighteen, though I was really more my own master than he is."

"Yes," observed his mother, "I could wish he were more of a thorough boy."

"He's such a confounded young dandy too," Humphrey went on. "I should have thought school would have knocked that out of him. Did you hear the way he slanged old Bennett yesterday morning because those sticking-plaster boots of his were not shiny enough? Poor old Bennett, he has grown so accustomed to my dowdy ways that he looked quite taken aback."

Margaret laughed. She had witnessed the episode about the polished boots, and could afford to laugh at such little traits. She saw other things about her son which made her more inclined to weep.

"I'll tell you what, though," resumed her husband, "the boy is an uncommon good shot. He quite surprised me to-day. He seemed to bring down every bird he looked at. He must have struck others the same way, for Axminster has asked him for his shooting next month, and as the number of head killed at these parties is all he cares for in this world, he would not be likely to invite the boy unless he shot well."

"But I hope you will not let him go visiting about too much, Humphrey."

"I do not like it," he replied, "but I do not see that if nowadays a boy wants to do a thing, anybody, least of all his father, can prevent him. Now the question is what he is to do next."

"What! have you given up the thought of sending him to Oxford?"

"Well, I have been thinking it over, and talking it over with him, and I do not think it is the least use his going there. I was talking to his tutor when I went to Eton the other day, and I am afraid he has been horribly idle all his time at school; and this Newton does not think he would have the ghost of a shadow of a chance of matriculating unless he made up his mind to cram hard, and he is not likely to do that. In fact, the boy does not wish to go to college."

"Then what will he do?"

"He seems to have more fancy for the army than anything. He wants, if he can, to get into the Blues, two of his chief chums belonging to them. I don't know yet how it is to be worked, but I should think I could get him in; and if he wishes it he can work quite well enough to pass whatever the examination is. He is no fool, he is only idle."

"And would you like that as a profession for him?" asked Margaret.

"Yes, would not you?"

"No, Humphrey, I cannot say I should. I do not, of course, know Arnold as well as you do, but I own I should be afraid of that sort of life for him. If he does get into the Blues, he would, I should think, have very little to do. He would be hanging about London and going to balls and parties all the summer, and shooting at house after house most of the winter."

"Then what would you like to do with him?"

"If he wants to go into the army," she replied, "I should like him to be put into a regiment where he would have more work, and anyhow be kept from London and these dreadful shooting parties."

"And," said her husband, "run the risk of his being sent abroad, or to India?"

"Yes, Humphrey, even to India. Indeed, dearest, my common sense tells me it would be better."

"Well, Margaret," he replied, "it is not often that you express positive opinions about Arnold like that. And I must say you are the most Spartan of mothers! Most women would give their right hand rather than that their sons should go off, perhaps for ten years, to India. But then I do not suppose you ever did care for Arnold in the way some mothers care for their sons. It would have half killed my mother to lose me like that!"

Margaret winced; but in another moment she could have smiled, for the way in which her husband, under the influence of the even tenor of his life, had quite forgotten the past, tickled her sense of humour. He had a rare power of forgetting what it was disagreeable to him to remember.

"Anyhow," he continued, "if you are Spartan, I am not. Do not forget that the boy has not got to work for his bread. Moreover he is my only son, and if he lives must have this place some day. So I naturally wish to have him near me, and to have him get to care for the old place and the people about. So I am afraid that your Indian scheme will not come off."

"Not that I am quite pleased with the boy myself," he went on, after a pause. "As I said before, he is a man, when he ought to be a boy. But I think it is only the change from Eton that is required. I dare say I left him there too long. As he did not work, he might have been better away. I rather gather that he got among a set of fellows who did him no good, and toadied him for the sake of what they could get out of him now or hereafter."

Lord Alne paused for a few minutes, during which he poked the fire, pondering. Then he resumed :

"Now it is all over, I will tell you what I was a good deal worried about at the time. I did not tell you before, because you could not have helped in the matter, and it would only have worried you for nothing. In fact, this is why I made up my mind to take him away from Eton at once, instead of leaving him till Easter as I had intended. His house-master wrote to ask to see me, so I went off, as you know. It appeared that the boy had been getting into a stupid sort of love affair scrape. I don't think there was anything actually dishonourable in the affair, but I know that I had to pay by the ears! And anyhow I felt he was better away at once."

"My poor Arnold!" murmured his mother.

The tone, rather than the words, roused her husband's spirit of opposition.

"You don't expect all boys to be saints or monks, do you?" he said. "So you need not be so tragic about it. Perhaps you would like your son to be like those long-cassocked, ritualistic deformities at St. Rood's?"

Margaret burst into a merry laugh which proved infectious, for her husband, getting over his momentary pepperiness, joined in.

"My dear Humphrey," she said, when again grave, "you know perfectly well that those men are my pet aversion. They are such utterly vapid imitations, or rather would-be imitations of all that I hold most sacred. No, Humphrey dear," she continued in a different tone, and with one of those fits of confidence about her deeper feelings, which from her circumstances had become rare. "What I should like my son to be, and if I dared have any hope, what I should pray that he might be, is a real Christian, law-abiding man, upright and just in all his ways; living in the fear of God, fearing to sin against Him, and, because of that, fearing nothing else. A man who,

as the Old Testament words say, 'walked before God,' doing his life's duty in His sight. And I should like my son to be so innocent of heart that his mother, his sister, and some day his wife, might know its innermost corners without blushing. Pure in life, firm in faith, living according to God's holy will and commandments—that is what I wish I dared hope that my son might be. And yet I might hope so much further than that."

"I am sure I do not know what more you could want," replied Humphrey, quickly; and then there was a long pause, during which he pondered over his wife's words, repeating some of them half audibly to himself. "I am afraid, my Margaret," he then continued, "that your ideal of mankind is sadly Utopian; and if you knew more of the world you would know it to be so. And I fear that Arnold, at any rate, will not come up to it, the young scamp! And yet, Margaret, you will see, that though he is not built on the lines you lay down, he will do very well. He will turn into a splendid fellow in a few years, when he has sown his wild oats. All through his school life, though he has been a sad idle dog, and been a bit wild lately, he has borne the highest character for truth and honour, and manliness and all the things that turn out a real, downright, good man! Hang it! there is the dressing gong! Our peace is over! Don't be late, and go and live in Utopia instead of dressing, there's a good soul!"

How painful an impression this conversation left on Margaret's mind it is hard to describe. The thought of her poor Arnold haunted her. Deprived from early childhood by the arbitrary will of his father of the most ordinary helps that belong to home influence, he now evinced what, even according to his father's standard of morality, looked like a precocious leaning towards what is evil instead of towards what is good. Poor helpless, unhelped boy! And now, thanks to his personal attractions and position, he was about to be plunged headlong into every sort of temptation, that his mother could think of, and into many a one that she could not think of and knew nothing about! Well might the thought of her son haunt her as she sat and made conversation to her guests during that long, long evening.

She looked forward through night-marey vistas of time, seeing in imagination her son committing sin upon sin, till the

possible, nay probable accumulation of unrepented, unforgiven sins nearly drove her mad; for Arnold would have never existed had it not been for her!

She and Gertrude could pray for him, and that was all that could be done. Though he were drowning under her eyes, his mother was powerless to help him in any other way.

Truly she was very much alone. Though indeed there can exist no cure, except the removal of its cause, for the bitter pain of seeing those whom we have brought into the world, sinning against Almighty God and terribly endangering their souls, still in Margaret's case it is difficult to say how much her burden would have been lightened if she could have shared it with him who ought to have shared it, shared the anxiety, the fear, the prayers, for this boy who had been given in trust to him as well as to her. Was he blind, that he could neither see the boy's danger nor his own great responsibility to do all in his power to avert it?

It is we who say this. If Margaret had such thoughts, she kept them very secretly in her own heart.

It was about this time that Margaret began to fail in health. She could not fix a date when she began to feel ill, but she got visibly weak and ailing.

Humphrey made her see doctor after doctor, but they could discover no cause for her ailments, and because they could discover nothing he grew quite happy again about her, and felt sure that she was getting quite well.

Margaret, on the other hand, felt sure that she was getting worse every day, and that though doctors could discover nothing wrong, some unknown mischief must be going on.

She had no wish to die. She was a woman in whom love of life, and love of those dear to her were too strongly developed to make dying easy to her. Parting from her husband, parting from Gertrude, would be a hard, hard task, but it was for her son she wished most to live. At present she could do nothing for him, and she knew it, but the day might come when she could. She felt that were the choice given to her she could consent to live to the very hoariest old age, to wait and watch for the chance of helping this son whom, stranger as he was to her, she loved so dearly.



## Reviews.

---

### I.—THE LIFE OF CHRIST.<sup>1</sup>

FATHER MAAS' *Life of Jesus Christ* has speedily passed to a second edition, and we must testify our pleasure at this proof that it has received the appreciation it deserves. Possibly the title, *Life of Christ*, may mislead some into the notion that it is a Life of our Lord after the method of Fouard or Didon. It is not this, but rather a Harmony of the Gospels, with a short commentary annexed. There are two methods of framing a Harmony. One by arranging the four texts in four parallel columns, setting opposite to one another the portions which are considered by the harmonist to refer to the same incident. This is the method followed by Father Coleridge in his *Life of our Life*. The other method is by forming a single continuous text out of the four. Each of these methods has its special advantages and its concurrent disadvantages. But for the object which Father Maas has in view the second method is decidedly preferable. He tells us his book is intended "for readers who have neither leisure nor opportunity to consult many commentaries and works on ancient history;" for that class, in fact, of educated Catholics (and non-Catholics too) who, when they read the Gospels, desire to have an intelligent knowledge of the meaning, which need not go very deep, but which as far as it does go is accurate, and takes into account the historical and topographical as well as the dogmatic features.

This class is numerous, and we would wish them to think of the volume before us as a quite indispensable handbook to their Gospel readings. Father Maas is eminently practical and eminently clear: he provides just the sort of comments which are required without running into excess, and he writes

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Jesus Christ* according to the Gospel History. By the Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J., Professor of Oriental Languages at Woodstock, Maryland. Second Edition. St. Louis: Herder, 1892.

in a simple and concise language which all can follow with pleasure.

The text has been framed with great care, so that every particular to be found in one or other of the four Gospels is inserted, and nothing beyond that added. It is also divided into paragraphs, and to each paragraph the date of the year and, if possible, of the month or week is prefixed. These dates are of course in most instances the result of calculations and conjectures, and are not all equally certain. In some cases also they represent the author's own theory, as when the Epiphany is assigned to the first day of February immediately following the Nativity. But it is very serviceable and free from all objection to have the dates set down in this manner as results, if only the readers will bear in mind that the author does not claim for his assignments more than their proper and varying degrees of probability. Another thing to be remembered about these dates is, as the author warns his readers, that they are reckoned and designated from the actual Birth of our Lord, not from the vulgar era, which is generally held to be four years out.

Harmonizing the four Gospels has its difficulties which press harder on a writer who arranges his text continuously like Father Maas, than on one who gives each text separately in its own column, as Father Coleridge does. Father Maas frames his text according to the most probable opinions, and then states the difficulties and the theories for its solution in the notes.

We should like to convey a better impression of the character of the book by giving a specimen of its annotations, and we may take the following with advantage as bearing on a subject which a few years since considerably exercised Professor Huxley.

*The herd of swine.*—The devils asked for this, (1) because it is their greatest delight to injure other creatures, especially men ; (2) by destroying the herd of swine, they might succeed in exciting the inhabitants of that place against Jesus. The possession of the swine which followed, and their self-destruction, is the strongest evidence for the reality of possession by personal demons. For neither the impress of human feelings, which beasts seem to catch at times, nor the fright struck into the swine-herds by the cries and last struggles of the poor demoniac, are sufficient to explain the sudden possession and self-destruction of the beasts which followed the permission Jesus gave the demons to enter them.

*Were stifled in the sea.*—Jesus acted here as supreme Lord over all earthly goods; as God can and does take away our life, when and how He pleases, so He has a right to take away our property. His power includes, by its very nature, the right to use that power. If asked, why Jesus permitted such an event, we answer: (1) If the owners of the swine were Jews, they broke their law by the keeping of swine, for the Rabbinical teaching forbade it. (2) If the owners were Gentiles, they probably scandalized and seduced many Jews by keeping such herds of swine.

In these few words we have the root of the matter placed before us, and the passage may be fairly taken as typical of what is in the book.

To history and geography the author gives particular care, and above all to what relates to the Holy Places. On each of them he has full expositions accompanied by excellent plates. He has also written a careful Introduction on the authenticity of the Gospels.

---

## 2.—IRISH CHURCH HISTORY.<sup>1</sup>

The excellent Ecclesiastical History of Dr. Lanigan has remained incomplete and is not up to date, for since his time the researches of men like O'Curry, W. Sullivan, Moran, Todd, Reeves, Whitley Stokes, Bagwell, and the Calendars of English and Irish State Papers have thrown a flood of light on the political and ecclesiastical history of Ireland. The difficulty of the task has hitherto deterred Irish scholars from writing a connected history of the Irish Church. But Dr. Bellesheim, accustomed to grapple with difficulties, and by his studies in English and Scottish history, well prepared for so arduous an undertaking, thought the time had come for composing an Irish Church History. The first volume, which comprises the history from 432—1509, has some considerable gaps in it, and here and there is but an outline, but the fault does not lie with the author. Very many important documents remain still unpublished. There is a great want of monographs, and those that exist are often faulty in method. The wonder is not that it is not as complete as we could desire, but that there is comparatively so little wanting. Catholics like Dr. Funk, Protestant critics like Pflugk-Hartung and Hassenkamp, have

<sup>1</sup> A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland von der Einführung der Christenthums bis auf die Gegenwart*. Three vols. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890-1.

all fully acknowledged the merits of Dr. Bellesheim's books, and we thoroughly agree with them.

We rather miss in the volumes a clear account of the different races that inhabited Ireland, of their migrations and racial differences, of their religious ideas and of their political institutions. A succinct account of all this would have enabled the reader to understand better the Irish character. One of the most difficult problems of Irish history is to separate later additions from the historic kernel of the Life of St. Patrick. Dr. Bellesheim follows Father B. Morris both as regards the various events of St. Patrick's life and also in denying the authenticity of the Bull of Adrian IV., and does not accept the evidence of Giraldus Cambrensis in its favour. He thinks that the English conquerors were too few, the English Government was too weak to maintain law and order, and that they kept up feuds and wars in Ireland ; but one merit they have : that through them new Orders were introduced and many monasteries established.

The second volume treats the history from 1509 — 1690. Nowhere can we find a more satisfactory description of the historical and political history of Ireland. The learned Canon has drawn not only from printed books, but also from Roman manuscripts and other unprinted matter. The state of things in Ireland at the time of the Reformation was in some respects worse than in England, the churches had decayed during the long feuds and wars, lawlessness and violence had impaired the innate respect of the people for holy things. But the attempt of Henry VIII. to introduce the new doctrine imported from England scandalized the people, roused clergy and laity, and gave an impulse to Catholic reformers. The vices of the preachers of the new doctrine made the people cling to the old religion. The Government happily was too weak to force the reluctant natives, and besides, the love of the faith was rooted in the hearts of the people far more deeply than in England. Thus Protestantism remained an exotic plant in Ireland. The Holy See was able to send Legates to Ireland more easily than to England, the Religious Orders were never driven out as in England, because they found shelter with the Catholic magnates. Dr. Bellesheim, in writing of this period, has followed closely the history of the Tudors by Bagwell. The latter has taken far too lenient a view of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, who were, if possible, worse enemies

of Ireland than even Cromwell. Cromwell wanted to cut off the Irish race by one stroke, the former subjected them to a continued martyrdom, and let loose on them their licentious and unpaid soldiery. The crying injustice committed by James I. in the colonization of Ulster, the folly of inviting the scum of Scotland and England to colonize the North of Ireland, seems to us not to have sufficient stress laid upon it by Dr. Bellesheim. It was a most momentous step, for it laid the seed of the civil war in Ireland, of lasting feud and strife, and of the Protestant ascendancy which has been the cause of so many evils.

The history of the Civil War, 1641—52, is very fully treated. Bellesheim defends the policy of Rinuccini, the Papal Legate, and blames the Catholic confederates and those bishops and priests that were opposed to him. Yet men like Bishop Roche and Dr. Lynch were opposed to Rinuccini, and judged that the Irish had no chance against the English Republicans, unless Catholics and Protestants were united. In the war of 1689—90 the case was quite different. At that time it was foolish for James II. to expect help from the Irish Protestants. If he had disarmed the Protestants, and had drilled his soldiers, then he might have maintained himself in Ireland. Bellesheim's account of this period is rather brief, and the serious faults of James are very gently passed over. His want of sympathy with the Irish, his anxiety to maintain the ascendancy of the English, caused him to be hated by the Irish. William III. was a perfidious, wicked man, but was far cleverer and more energetic than his father-in-law. He wanted to enrich his Dutch followers with the possessions of the Irish Jacobites, but was checked by Parliament. The Popes did all in their power to relieve the poor Irish Catholics, and sent large sums of money to Ireland; they also tried to obtain the protection of the Irish by the Emperor, the ally of William III. The Irish Catholics were crushed during the first half of the eighteenth century, shut out from political life, and endured an intolerable thralldom. The oppression of the Presbyterians by the Anglicans, the American wars and the defeats of the English, roused the Irish nation. England was obliged to grant an independent Parliament, but the opportunity of obtaining full equality for Ireland was missed. Bellesheim seeks to excuse the rising of the Catholics, 1798, by pointing out the loyalty of bishops and clergy, and by showing that Protestants were the originators of

the civil war. The fact was that the people of Wexford and other counties were goaded into rebellion, and the chief officials abused their trust. Arthur O'Leary was, if not a spy of the English, a mercenary who received a pension from Government. Had he been a true patriot, then he would not have defended and justified the wrong-doings of the Irish Government. We do not think he deserves the praise Bellesheim bestows on him.

It is no easy task to do justice to men who have been our contemporaries, or to form a fair judgment of quite recent events. Dr. Bellesheim seeks to escape the difficulty by giving us the praises bestowed on Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop McHale by their admirers. He justifies Archbishop McHale, who disapproved the appointment of Dr. Newman as Rector of the Catholic University of Dublin, by the plea that the University ought to be a national institution and manned only by Irish Professors. Dr. Bellesheim has confined himself to a few short remarks on the different Religious Orders and their work. Here we have some excellent monographs, as the *Lives of Mary Aikenhead*, *Nano Nagle*, *Catherine McAuley*, and the beautiful book by Miss Tynan, *A Nun and her Order*. A short history of the missions, and the successes achieved by the missionaries, would have shown how much Ireland owes to her Religious Orders.

Canon Bellesheim's book is indispensable for the student of Irish Church history. Many a year will pass before it will be superseded. Let us hope that the study of the Irish Church history may flourish among the Irish clergy, that men like Colgan and Lynch may find many imitators.

---

### 3.—ST. PETER AND THE FIRST YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY.<sup>1</sup>

The rapid and well-deserved success of the English version of Abbé Fouard's *Christ the Son of God* has encouraged the translator to give us an English version of the work on St. Peter by the same author. In doing this he has added to English Catholic literature a book of the very greatest merit. Readers of the previous work will naturally anticipate a high standard of excellence in the present volume; and they will not be disappointed. It is an admirable book. Sobriety of judgment,

<sup>1</sup> *St. Peter and the first years of Christianity.* By the Abbé Fouard. Translated from the French by G. F. X. Griffith. London: Longmans.



profound and varied erudition, true Catholic feeling, and an exceptional degree of literary taste, characterize every page of the work.

The book contains twenty chapters together with an Appendix, treating of several points of special interest. The Acts of the Apostles naturally constitute the chief source of information concerning the early years of Christianity, but the author's intimate familiarity with the profane history and literature of the first centuries of our era, and with the writings of the Fathers, has enabled him to give us a most interesting and vivid picture of the Pagan world which Christianity had to conquer, and of the first steps in that conquest. The Jews of the dispersion, the early life and conversion of St. Paul, Antioch, the persecution under Herod Agrippa, the religion of Rome, the Stoics of the Empire, and the legal status of the Christians, are each and all chapters replete with valuable information presented in an entertaining and attractive style.

Chapter xii. affords the general reader a clear and useful sketch of the history of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Here the author justly adopts the view that the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews is substantially the Aramæan form of St. Matthew, with corruptions introduced from Ebionite and Gnostic heresies. Chapter xx. gives an excellent account of the Gospel of St. Mark—"the interpreter of Peter." The history of this Gospel—"the Memoirs of Peter"—as St. Justin has styled it, is of special interest at present in connection with the recent recovery of the Apocryphal Gospel according to Peter.

We feel that we cannot speak too highly in praise of Abbé Fouard's work. He has apparently set before himself the project of going over the same ground as Renan, and of furnishing us with a history of the origin of Christianity in a series of volumes that shall be as scholarly in character as they are orthodox and Catholic in tone. This is a noble scheme: and few men are as well fitted to carry it out satisfactorily as Abbé Fouard. His *Life of our Lord* is the very best form of reply to the blasphemous *Vie de Jésus* of the French infidel who has lately been summoned to his last reckoning, and the present volume follows in the same style and spirit. The work aims primarily at the positive exposition of the history of the infancy of the Church as presented to us in the most certain testimonies of the literature of the first two centuries. Controversy plays but a secondary part, and is mainly of an

indirect character. This is as it should be, and is by far the most convincing method of treating such subjects.

As regards the style of the translation we completely coincide with the judgment of Cardinal Gibbons, that "it is a faithful transcript of the original expressed in idiomatic English." Whether the result be due to the grave and calm tone of the author's French, or to the skill of the translator, we do not attempt to decide, but we believe most readers will agree with us that there is very little in the book to recall the fact that the work is a translation. If any defect there be, we think it consists in straining too much after English idiomatic expressions. This has led at times to the introduction of phrases so homely as almost to verge on slang, and occasionally produces an anti-climax that weakens the force and dignity of a fine passage. These blemishes however are very rare, and are more than compensated for by the thoroughly English style of the language throughout.

---

#### 4.—THE JESUITS IN POLAND.<sup>1</sup>

The object of this little book is to show the influence the Jesuits had in Poland, and to prove that by their persecuting policy they were one of the chief causes of its disintegration and consequent partition among the neighbouring great Powers. It would be quite as easy for a Catholic writer—and certainly more in accordance with true history—to prove that the Reformers by their endeavours to overthrow the old religion in Poland were the real cause of its ruin, whilst the Society by its labours for the unity of religion put off the evil day. But in reality, apart from all religious quarrels, Poland was always made up of elements which tended to fly apart rather than to coalesce, as the author himself admits in his first chapter. And besides, had the Society never obtained a footing in the country, we may judge what would have been the discord in the land from the disgraceful conduct of the Protestant sects in the very face of the enemy, as described by Mr. Pollard. (p. 23.)

The youthful author deserves credit for having at least consulted a considerable number of books in the composition of his prize essay, but though he seems at times anxious to be

<sup>1</sup> *The Lothian Essay, 1892.* By A. F. Pollard, B.A.

impartial, there is a want of judgment and discrimination in his selection of authorities which betrays the immature student.

In the first four chapters he praises the Society for its great zeal in doing good. Thus of the reign of Stephen Batory, we read :

Here [at Cracow] they [the Jesuits] held four separate services on Sundays, when their preaching made many converts. Nothing came amiss to their zeal, they formed associations to look after the sick ; they supplied help to those whom disease or shame prevented from seeking it ; they paid the debts of many and relieved families reduced to the utmost misery. . . . At Lemberg in Red Russia, though there were only three members, they made excursions to thirteen or fourteen villages in the neighbourhood, where the clergy were roused to greater activity, and many conversions were made. . . . From these Colleges [in Lithuania] they made it a regular habit to visit villages in the neighbourhood on Sundays ; by this means they got at thousands, who had never professed any religion before except the relics of a primitive nature-worship. . . . At Njeswicz they attempted to remedy the deplorable system of early marriages.

However, he concludes the praise with the inevitable "but" :

But in the next reign [that of Sigismund III.] the Society began to exhibit more unlovely traits, and like all sects which control political power, to use against its adversaries the methods not of persuasion, but of persecution and proscription.

It is in his proof of this assertion that we find fault. For after frequently reminding his readers of the bitterness of religious parties in those days, he himself gives credence to a number of violent statements of the Society's bitterest enemies, merely because their accusations are found in print. For example, we should scarcely expect to find Andrew Wengierski quoted in a sober historical essay as the chief witness against a Religious Order. Every student of Polish history is aware that this leader of the Polish Socinians, though an authority on the tenets of that sect, is utterly unreliable as an historian. His unmeasured abuse and notorious hatred of the old religion would in itself discredit his testimony. Mr. Pollard also quotes the complaints of the Rokosz of 1607 against the Jesuits. Certainly this confederation cannot be accused of partiality towards the Society, seeing that one of the chief objects of its convention was to inquire into and protest against the influence

of the Order. And yet in our author's words this very confederation "was not agreed with respect to the Jesuits, and there were bitter altercations on the subject; finally it was decided that they should not be expelled from Poland, but be confined to the schools, that they might be free to devote themselves to education." The education of the youth of the country to be left in their hands! Does this look as if they were guilty of the crimes ascribed to them by Wengierski and other Socinians?

Another source of accusations is an intemperate letter of the University of Cracow. Who would think of quoting the Sorbonne in an impartial account of the Jesuits of France? Even supposing that the Jesuit students were guilty of rioting by way of retaliation, would this prove that their Professors were to blame? As well make the Senate of the University of Oxford responsible for the old Town and Gown riots. Surely it is going to the extreme of credulity to believe, on such an authority as the rival University of Cracow, that the Society had "more than once deluged the city with innocent blood." In spite of the full acquittal of the Society of Jesus (p. 47) by Argentus, who was sent as special visitor to inquire into its alleged misdeeds, our author seems to have been determined by the mere number and violence of the calumnies, and consequently in his summing up condemns the Society as a persecutor.

The chief fault of the whole essay is that it seeks to cover too much ground, with the natural result that the writer can attempt to verify but few of his statements. Thus, had he only dipped into some text-book of Jesuit Moral Philosophy, he would have been saved from re-asserting the often exploded accusation of the doctrine of "the end justifying the means" (p. 50); and the most elementary acquaintance with the Constitutions of the Society would have prevented him from falling into a ridiculous blunder regarding the distinction between the Professed and the Coadjutors. Indeed the whole subject was far too vast a one for an Oxford Prize Essay. On the other hand, the style of the book throughout is easy and agreeable, and the occasional indications of a wish to be fair-minded, to which we have before alluded, leads us to hope for better things from this young author, when riper judgment and closer acquaintance with the original sources will enable him to weigh his authorities more accurately.

5.—THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.<sup>1</sup>

Few living Frenchmen possess a more thorough acquaintance with the history, character, and details of the great revolutionary upheaval of 1789, than M. Charles d'Héricault, or are better qualified to write a true and faithful description of its crimes and follies. A man of singular ability and great research, he has made it his business for many years to study the character, origin, and progress of the Revolution in all its details, and has left nothing untouched that could throw any light upon the subject. Some years ago he started an interesting periodical, *La Revue de la Révolution*, devoted to this very purpose, and numberless original documents of the utmost importance were published in its pages. M. d'Héricault is also well-known as the author of a considerable number of works of fiction of a very high order of merit, many of which have been favourably noticed in English journals. The present work, however, is unquestionably the greatest which he has ever produced, and the one with which his name will always be associated. We have no hesitation in saying that it is by far the best work on the subject we have ever come across, and that no library with any pretensions to an historical reputation can afford to be without it. M. d'Héricault, as we need hardly remind our readers, is an earnest and devout Catholic, and the orgies of the Revolution, it is needless to say, meet with the most scathing and merciless criticism at his hands. The book is written with all the *esprit* of an exceedingly clever and satirical Frenchman, who thoroughly understands his subject, and who remembers at the same time that he is a Christian writer. No one can read his pages without realizing the hideous, immoral, and grotesque character of the Revolution, and what a fearful curse it has been to unborn generations of his countrymen. It is hard to say whether irreligion, obscenity, destructiveness, cruelty, or folly was its strongest and most striking characteristic, but on the whole we incline to think it was folly. It is needless to say that the society which produces such a state of things, was to a great extent corrupt, just as was the condition of the Church in England and Germany at the

<sup>1</sup> *La France Révolutionnaire, 1789—1839.* Par Charles d'Héricault. Ouvrage illustré de plus de 250 gravures; scènes, vues, portraits, d'après les meilleurs dessinateurs des xviii. et xix. siècles. Paris: Librairie académique Didier, Perrin et Cie., éditeurs, Quai des Grands-Augustins, 35.

time of the Reformation. Neither movement could have achieved the success which it did, had the body, politic and religious, been in a healthy condition. What proves perhaps, more than anything else, the essentially wicked character of the French Revolution, is the fact that its greatest crimes were perpetrated, not in the commencement, when numberless grievances of a more or less serious character existed, and which might have afforded some excuse for its orgies, but at a later period when every one of them had ceased to exist. The nobles were massacred at a period when every vestige of the feudal system had for ever disappeared from the soil of France, the clergy at a time when the wealth and power of that order had given place to poverty and helplessness, and the Royal Family at a moment when not a trace of the old monarchical system remained in existence. M. d'Héricault's work is divided into four parts: I. "L'Ancien Régime;" II. "La Politique Révolutionnaire;" III. "La Morale;" IV. "La Civilisation." "L'Ancien Régime," includes in its sub-sections: 1. "Le caractère sociale sous Ancien Régime;" 2. "La situation économique et politique;" 3. "La cause de la Révolution." "La Politique Révolutionnaire," treats of: 1. "Le gouvernement;" 2. "L'administration." "La Morale" includes: 1. "La religion;" 2. "La charité;" 3. "L'enseignement;" 4. "La justice." "La Civilisation" treats of: "Les mœurs;" 2. "Les lettres;" 3. "La science—les arts;" 4. "L'économie politique;" 5. "L'Armée." A short additional chapter on "La Régime Moderne," concludes the work. It is a large quarto volume of seven hundred and fifty-six pages, enriched with numberless illustrations of a high order, nearly all of which are reproductions of contemporary drawings, and serve to largely enhance its value as a true and faithful picture of the times.

The introductory chapter deals at considerable length with the characteristics of the various classes of French society as they existed before the Revolution, and contains many anecdotes of a most interesting and instructive kind, for which we regret we cannot find room. We must, however, insert one short extract respecting the *noblesse*.

This leads us far away from the Marchioness whom Voltaire oved, and the Duchess whom Crébillon the younger invented. The Marchioness was a real personage, we are well acquainted with her, and we know that she was degraded enough to deserve the love of



Voltaire. The Duchess, too, was not altogether an invention, of that too I am very well aware. But the Voltarian Marchioness and the Crébillonesque Duchess represented the society of bygone days about as much as the drunken men who bawl in the streets of Paris on Sunday evenings constitute the great city itself. They shout and sing, and their noise sounds everywhere. But there is something else to be found in Paris.

But what about the immorality of the clergy under the old *régime* of which one has heard so often? Was that a mere invention? On this point I have made inquiries of people who did not exactly move in the highest circles, but who were well informed about it. I mean the guardians of public morals, under M. de Tartines. Take the year 1761, when the corruption of the eighteenth century was at its height. How many bad priests do they tell us of among the clergy of Paris, who were at that time a numerous and wealthy body, whom the Encyclopedists would fain have led into unbelief and immorality? Just five, of whom one was a religious. I do not mean to assert that these five represent the sum-total of all the priests in Paris in whom some weakness might be found, but I say that they were all who were openly immoral; and whilst allowing that the tone of morality is higher amongst the clergy of the present day, I must add that the priests of the old *régime* have been terribly calumniated.

We have nothing but praise to give this great and truly Christian work, which we believe will do much to dissipate many of the fables of revolutionary writers. Many of our readers will doubtless recollect one of M. d'Hericault's finest historical novels, *Les Aventures de deux Parisiennes pendant la Terreur*, which was published in THE MONTH a few years ago, under the title of, "1794: A Tale of the Terror."

---

#### 6.—TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.<sup>1</sup>

This little volume is a reprint by the Catholic Truth Society of two articles which recently appeared in THE MONTH. On this account we shall content ourselves with merely recalling to mind the subject-matter. It has long been known that Tatian, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, composed a work on the Gospels, called the *Diatessaron*. This work itself was, however, lost, or at least only imperfectly preserved, under a form which did not sufficiently certify its

<sup>1</sup> *Recent Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospels: Tatian's Diatessaron.* By Michael Maher, S.J. With Appendix on the Gospel according to St. Peter. Catholic Truth Society. Price 6d.

identity. Now if this *Diatessaron* was a Harmony of the Gospels, as every reference to it seemed to indicate, it has placed beyond doubt that the four Gospels had been composed, received in the Church, and regarded as inspired writings, at a date long anterior to its formation; and there was a summary end to the rationalistic criticism which refers the origin of our Gospels to the middle or latter half of the second century. The critics in question fully realized the danger to their theory, and strove to maintain that the *Diatessaron* was not a Harmony of the four Gospels at all, but the occasionally mentioned "Gospel according to the Hebrews," of which another form was the "Gospel according to St. Peter." This was the line taken by the notorious author of *Supernatural Religion*, published in 1875.

But Nemesis quickly overtook this rash author. When he wrote, the *Diatessaron* itself was on the eve of re-discovery, and it is now indisputable that it is a Harmony. Even the Gospel of St. Peter has within the last few months afforded clear evidence that it has no connexion whatever with the *Diatessaron*.

Mr. Maher tells the story of the re-discovery of the *Diatessaron* with so clear and graphic a pen as to make it intelligible and interesting to all; while at the same time the reasoning whereby he establishes the date and integrity of the text is, at least in our judgment, most convincing. He concludes by saying: "The simple history of such a document as the *Diatessaron*, the *Apology of Aristides*, or the *Epitaph of St. Abercius* (two other recent finds), is the best answer to the agnostic essayist and novelist, who talk so glibly of the 'Tendency of Modern Thought.'" Those who will do Mr. Maher the honour to read his little tract will, we are certain, arrive at the same conviction.

---

#### 7.—SOUND AND MUSIC.<sup>1</sup>

The author of this treatise is to be congratulated on the success with which he has attained the object he proposed to himself in publishing it. He tells us in his Preface:

The present volume has grown out of a course of lectures given last year in the Catholic University of America, at Washington. . . .

<sup>1</sup> *Sound and Music*. By the Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., Professor of Physics in the University of Notre Dame. Large octavo. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co., 1892.

The main purpose of the book is to give musicians and general readers an exact knowledge based on experiment of the principles of acoustics, and to present at the same time a brief exposition of the physical basis of musical harmony.

Both musicians and general readers will welcome a treatment of the science of acoustics which is at once so full and so interesting. While touching on all points of the subject necessary to completeness, the lecturer has managed to avoid abstruseness, and never talks over the heads of his audience. The form of lectures is specially adapted for this clearness and brightness of treatment in the hands of a skilful man, and these ten lectures even when reduced to as many printed chapters have not lost all that stimulating effect produced by direct address. It is always difficult in writing about experimental subjects to dispense with experiments altogether, and yet though a chief feature of this course was the repetition, with the most elaborate instruments, of the various phenomena of sound—so detailed and precise is the description of the apparatus used, and the experiments performed, that it needs small effort to realize them, perhaps even more intelligently than if they had been actually produced before us, without such explanation. This effect is aided by the beautifully executed illustrations, which are here in profusion, and which in clearness and accuracy could hardly be surpassed.

The general plan of the treatise does not differ from that of similar works on the subject. We have four lectures at the beginning, discussing the production and propagation of sound—the fundamental distinction between musical sound and noise—an exposition of the laws affecting the intensity and pitch of sonorous vibrations, followed by a description of the experiments by which the velocity of sound has been measured in various media, and the laws of its reflection and refraction determined. In this portion of the subject, and indeed throughout the work, due prominence is given to the history of the science. We are not left, as is so often the case, under the false impression that we owe all our knowledge to modern times. Aristotle and Pythagoras, Lucretius and Seneca, find their places alongside the classic names of the science—Hooke and Sauveur, Savant, Chladni, and the rest down to Young and Helmholtz and Mayer and Koenig. The little known investigations of a French ecclesiastic, Père Mersenne, who as early as 1640, did much to establish the foundations of modern

acoustics, are here reinstated in their deserved position of importance. Passing from the more generally acoustical discussion, the Professor devotes three lectures to the treatment of musical strings, vibrating rods, plates and bells, and musical tubes. Here again, as in the preceding division of the matter, the multiplied experiments and illustrations by which each new fact is introduced, make it easy for readers innocent of mathematics or unfamiliar with experimental methods, to grasp the principles taught, and to follow the line of reasoning by which each advance is secured. After a lecture on resonance and interference, the eighth and ninth lectures which follow are undoubtedly the most noteworthy of the series, dealing, as they do, with the interesting points of disagreement between the results of Dr. Koenig's researches and the views held by Professor Helmholtz regarding the nature of "beats," "combination-tones," and "quality." The excellent manner in which this difficult question is popularized, once for all, will considerably enlarge the circle of those who will henceforth be enabled to take an intelligent interest in the controversy. The point at issue is simply this: Are certain sounds, known as beats and beat-tones, subjective or objective? Our author manages to place within reach of the most unskilled the data for forming a judgment and taking sides in such an apparently uninviting question. Whilst evidently leaning to the view advocated by Dr. Koenig, that such sounds are purely subjective, to the extent at least that they are excited solely within the ear itself, Professor Zahm leaves us to form our own opinion, from a clear exposition of the experiments and reasoning on which each view is based. With an application of the principles already established in the tenth lecture the series ends.

Of the two main divisions of the work, it appears to us that the specifically musical parts are the least successful. There are certain inaccuracies of statement which might easily mislead the uninformed. The constant endeavour to avoid unnecessary technicalities, and to keep always on a level with his audience has doubtless been a cause of these lapses from exactness of expression. For instance, on p. 46, we are told that a *nodal* point in a wave is one where there is no motion. Now this is true only of *stationary undulation* not of *progressive waves*, a distinction which it is of importance not to obliterate. A "comma" ( $\frac{80}{81}$ ) is spoken of on p. 166, in a way which implies

that this interval may be actually heard in music, which must be far from the author's meaning. Again, on p. 389, it is stated that all the notes of the diatonic scale, excepting the second and seventh, are "consonant"—without the essential piece of information that they are so, not with one another, but with their tonic. There is also, on p. 396, a remark on the interval of the fifth which must have escaped the reviser's eye. Do any people "find it quite natural to take a fifth to a chorus that does not quite suit the pitch of their voice"? We do not understand it. Corrections of these and some similar faults may find a place in future editions without detracting from the interest and entertainment that every reader will derive from this admirable volume.

---

#### 8.—SIMON MAGUS.<sup>1</sup>

The writer of this essay has apparently spent much time and labour in looking up his authorities, and we regret that so much care on his part has not been put to a better purpose. He has divided the work into three parts. In the first the sources of information are given, which fall under three heads: The Simon of the New Testament, the Simon of the Fathers, and the Simon of the Legends. In the second is given a review of authorities. In the third the theosophy of Simon is explained.

The chief evidence bearing on Simon Magus we derive from the Acts, therefore with the authenticity of the Acts the thesis of our author's essay stands or falls. Yet his treatment of this point is among the most unsatisfactory and misleading features of the book. For instance, under the heading of "The Simon of the New Testament," the following occurs: "Acts (viii. 9—24); author and date unknown; commonly supposed to be 'by the author of the third Gospel, traditionally known as Luke,'" and a reference is given to Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Acts of the Apostles." We must take exception to this statement and the authority given as being at best misleading, for on looking up the reference we find it there categorically stated that the Acts are by the author of the third Gospel, and even M. Renan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Simon Magus. An Essay* by G. R. S. Mead, B.A., Fellow of the Theosophical Society. London: Theosophical Publishing Society.

<sup>2</sup> Renan, *Les Apôtres*, Introd. p. x. Paris, 1866.

thus writes: "Une chose hors de doute, c'est que les Actes ont eu le même auteur que le troisième Évangile et sont une continuation de cet Évangile. On ne s'arrêtera pas à prouver cette proposition, la quelle n'a jamais été sérieusement contestée. Les préfaces qui sont en tête des deux écrits, la dédicace de l'un et de l'autre à Théophile, la parfaite ressemblance du style et des idées fournissent à cet égard d'abondantes démonstrations." Moreover, the writer of the Acts ranks himself among the companions of St. Paul<sup>1</sup> and by constantly using the word "*we*" after the sixteenth chapter declares that he was a witness of the facts he is relating. As for his name, if not written in the Acts, we know it from tradition<sup>2</sup> and from the title given to the third Evangelist by all the manuscripts.<sup>3</sup> Even our adversaries recognize this; for them, as for us, "the author of the third Gospel is certainly Luke, Paul's disciple."<sup>4</sup>

Nor can we agree with his argument at the beginning of his Review of Authorities. He points out that the Simon of the Acts and the Simon of the Fathers both retain the two features of the possession of magical power and of collision with St. Peter, but that the latter display a hatred of his personality of which no trace is to be found in the Acts. Because indeed Justin, who was a native of Samaria, whence Simon came, does not mention Simon's offering money to St. Peter, he argues the sole authority for the statement is the Acts, and as according to him the Acts are not quoted prior to A.D. 177, and their writer is only traditionally claimed to be Luke, "we may safely consider ourselves in the *domain of legend and not of history*." From what has been stated above the weight to be attached to such criticism can easily be judged. Nor is the self-consistency of our author too obvious. After throwing over the testimony of the Acts as to Simon's offering money to St. Peter merely because St. Justin does not mention this incident, a little later he describes the testimony of this latter writer together with that of the Acts, of St. Irenæus and of Tertullian as a rubbish heap; whilst for the evidence of the *Philosophumena* he exhibits a most unexpected reverence. Of the author of this latter book we are ignorant; of his strong prejudices and unreliableness on some questions we are certain. Surely this is a strange way of arguing. We should

<sup>1</sup> Renan, *Les Apôtres*. (x.—xviii.)

<sup>2</sup> Frag. Murat. (170); St. Irenæus (180); Tertullian (207); &c.

<sup>3</sup> Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν. (A.C.D.) Κατὰ Λουκᾶν. (B.F.)

<sup>4</sup> Renan, *Les Apôtres*. (xviii.)



be rather inclined to say St. Justin confirms the statements in the Acts, in so far as he seems here to have gathered his facts from other sources. As for the pseudo-Clementine books, which were never regarded as of great authority, none of these early Fathers have borrowed from them: a point, by the way, which seems to have escaped the notice of our well-informed essayist.

Lastly, we have very fully the positive doctrinal portion of his work contained in the account of the Theosophy of Simon. As articles on Theosophy have recently appeared in *THE MONTH* detailed treatment of this subject is at present out of place. There is much scattered up and down the volume we should challenge had we the space at our disposal. In view of the evidence recently discovered by M. Studemund, the author's treatment of the question of the statue erected to Simon is utterly unwarrantable.<sup>1</sup> We would especially complain of the reckless manner in which sweeping assertions are put forward without a shadow of attempt at proof; as, "The evolution of the external form (the body) has been traced throughout all the kingdoms and is no longer in question." (p. 71.) Looking at the work as a whole we cannot help saying that the apparently honest enthusiasm of the writer and the labour and pains devoted to this book seem to us worthy of a better cause. However, from the observations we have made regarding his premises it will be obvious that we cannot commend it to the Catholic reader.

---

#### 9.—THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.<sup>2</sup>

This is one of that class of cheap but practical and thorough-going volumes which German authors know so well how to produce. In about four hundred pages it deals with the Sacrament of Penance in all its bearings. The learned author's primary intention was to furnish the priests of his own country with a useful handbook; and those of their English brethren, who, being fortunate enough to possess a little knowledge of the German language, may take up the book, will at once realize how well he has accomplished his task. Indeed this is by no means the only success achieved by the reverend author, for he

<sup>1</sup> *Bullettino*, 1882, pp. 107, 108.

<sup>2</sup> *Anleitung zur Verwaltung des heiligen Buss-sacraments*. Von Anton Tappehorn. Third Edit. Dülmen: Laumann, 1886.

is well known in Catholic Germany as a writer of many similar practical guides for the clergy.

The book does not pretend to originality. To predicate originality of a work on such a subject would be to utter the severest of censures. It is an expanded chapter of Moral Theology resting in its conclusions, as it must needs rest, on the usual well-known authorities. But though the matter it contains is already in the hands of all priests in the ordinary Latin handbooks, yet so readable is this volume that it makes us long to see its counterpart done in English. The danger of allowing one's book-knowledge of moral to grow dim, or of ousting it altogether to make way for so-called practical common sense and experience, is so great, that it is of the highest importance that every inducement should be provided to the heavily-worked missionary priest to combat it. A Latin manual is not very appetizing reading, whilst a work done on somewhat the same lines as those adopted by Canon Tappehorn could be taken up and read with facility, if not with pleasure, at any time.

We specially admire the skill shown by the author, in all parts of the work, in dividing and subdividing his matter, and also the thoroughness with which he goes into the various duties of the confessor as judge, as teacher, as physician, &c. Take for instance the very suggestive pages, on the office of judge, where, in the treatment of that most difficult subject, the priest's duties as questioner, the author shows himself a confessor of no mean tact and experience. Another remarkable feature is the exhaustive list of the different states of life, into each of which he goes with considerable fulness, often suggesting most useful matter for exhortation as adapted to children, parents, the engaged, the married, servants, officials, soldiers, the rich, labourers, artisans, &c.

If there is a blemish in the book, it is in the occasional tendency of the author to over-strictness, as for instance at page 257, where he quotes Concina's very severe words with regard to a certain class of the *Consuetudinarii*, we must remember St. Alphonsus' verdict on Concina, *auctor rigidissimus*. Again, earlier in the book, on page 37, we are told that to commit a grave sin on Sunday is an aggravating circumstance. St. Alphonsus (iii. b. n. 273), when treating of the Third Commandment, adopts the opposite opinion as the more probable; and no wonder, for the great array of authorities he can quote

for it is headed by St. Thomas himself. Up and down the book we might pick out other instances of this defect, but it is an ungrateful occupation and unnecessary too, for the book is intended for those who are already trained in moral, and it is to serve rather as a reminder than as the original source from which they learn.

---

10.—SECRET SERVICE UNDER PITT.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Fitzpatrick is well known as the great authority on the inner history of Ireland during the troubled years at the end of the last and the beginning of this century. He has made the subject his own, and before his life-long research every available source has given up its secrets. The consequence is that he can lay before us a narrative of events far surpassing in interest the most thrilling romance. Those who have read in days gone by his pitiful story of the *Sham Squire* will recollect how he unmasked one of that class of men, who are ever to be found in days of political disturbance, ready to sell their friends for gold. The ardent patriot, the self-sacrificing tribune, proves again and again, under the searching light of our historian, to have been but an unscrupulous informer.

The book teaches an important lesson, though a very painful one; nor can any one put it down without feeling the sadder if the wiser for its perusal. The writer does not express very clearly which way his sympathies go. But it is evident that the French revolutionary principles found in the last century too ready a soil, at all events among some of the Protestant Liberals of Ireland.

On the other hand the picture of Father O'Leary, with his Erastianism and Gallican tenets, his adulation of a Protestant and persecuting Government, and his keen eye to his pecuniary rewards, is a pendant to the portraits of the sham patriots which fill these pages. Dr. Hussey's character is anything but unsmirched, and shows how ill the pursuit of politics accords with priestly duties. By the way, the ex-Carthusian never lived, as our author in two places tells us, in the desert of La Trappe.

The book teems with such interesting detail, the thread of

<sup>1</sup> *Secret Service under Pitt.* By W. T. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A. Second Edition, enlarged. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892.

the treachery is so ruthlessly followed up, the proofs, so startling and so crushing, are brought out with such evidence, that we are not surprised that Mr. Lecky has again and again avowed his indebtedness to Mr. Fitzpatrick's work. To Mr. Froude's *English in Ireland* this book serves almost as a key, confirming much that is there, and unveiling the names of men who for years were trading on the devotion and confidence of their friends and their country.

The revelations about the Mutiny at the Nore, where the Irish—cruelly forced on board the British men-of-war, revenged this cruelty by bringing the nation to the verge of ruin, are only one among many like episodes in this strange contribution to history, so strange because so undoubtingly true.

Just because the arguments are so serried, the author is now and again tempted to aid the reader by repeating himself; and his wealth of information is such that he is unable to restrain himself in its narration. But the work is and must be a standard authority for the period it treats, and is a prodigy when we consider the age of its veteran author.

---

#### II.—HIERURGIA.<sup>1</sup>

The reputation of Dr. Rock's *Hierurgia* deservedly stands so high that we need hardly do more than call the attention of our readers to the handsome new edition of the work recently published by Mr. Hodges. The name of the editor, Mr. W. H. James Weale, is a sufficient guarantee of the conscientious care with which he has executed the task which he has undertaken, and which for the second and larger portion of the work has consisted mainly in the verification of references, and the correction and occasional amplification of the very numerous quotations. No doubt there is more than one chapter or section which he will have felt tempted to bring up to date; but on the whole he has probably been well advised to leave the doctrinal portion of *Hierurgia* in its original form. On the other hand he has made some alterations, on the whole judicious, in the "Notes on the

<sup>1</sup> *Hierurgia*; or, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, with Notes and Dissertations elucidating its Doctrines and Ceremonies, and numerous Illustrations. By David Rock, D.D. Third Edition, revised by W. H. James Weale. Two vols. London: Hodges, 1892.

Rubrics" which form the most important portion of Part I. Thus, besides omitting several notes which contained mere references to other portions of the work, the editor has omitted one or two passages of a controversial nature, and a long paragraph concerning ecclesiastical music. On the other hand, he has here and there made some additions to Dr. Rock's text, of which we give a single example by way of specimen. Mr. Weale thus describes the origin of the "Sequence."

In very early times the Alleluia was followed by a long series of jubilant notes sung to its last vowel without any words. This series of notes was called the Sequence, but owing to the difficulty of remembering these vocalizations . . . a custom arose in the north of Gaul of setting words to these notes. About the year 860 a monk of the Abbey of Jumièges, which had been laid waste by the Normans, sought refuge in the monastery of St. Gall, in the diocese of Constance. He brought with him the Antiphoner of his monastery, which contained several of these Sequences with words set to them. This volume was a source of inspiration to a young monk of St. Gall, named Notker, who at once set to work to imitate and improve on them. Notker's work found favour, and his compositions were introduced into the use of most Churches and Orders, and were called "Prosæ ad Sequentia," and later on "Prosæ." Of the many Proses composed during the middle ages, four only were retained in the Pian Missal [viz., *Victima Paschali*, *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, *Lauda Sion*, and *Dies Ire*.] . . . The *Stabat mater dolorosa* was restored to the Roman Missal by Benedict XIII. in 1727.

This is a distinct improvement on Dr. Rock's account of the matter. The work is not without blemishes; but no useful purpose would be served by a minute criticism of a work which after all is intended for the general reader rather than for the liturgical student.

---

#### 12.—A MOTHER'S SACRIFICE.<sup>1</sup>

We are glad to find the Catholic Truth Society is publishing stories of a higher order than the class of fiction, of which the obvious purpose is to improve the young, and teach the uneducated useful lessons in palatable form. The new volume which is now placed in the hands of the reader, is one which an educated person will peruse with pleasure. The stories, four in number,

<sup>1</sup> *A Mother's Sacrifice*, and other Tales. By A. M. Clarke. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1893.

which it contains, are highly interesting, well written, and original. They all have a sensational element, but there is nothing in them that the youngest and simplest might not read. They are very varied in subject. The scene of the first, which gives its name to the book, is laid in Russian Poland. It gives an excellent idea of the life of the Polish peasant under the oppressive dominion of Russia. The topic is one that is always attractive, the love of a mother for her only child, and the incredible suffering she is willing to undergo on its behalf. In this instance, however, it is not for the sake of a living child, but in the hope of benefiting the darling boy whom death has taken from her care, that the poor peasant woman endures cold, hunger, fatigue, humiliation. She hopes to obtain for him a better lot in the far-off land to which he is gone, a higher rank in the heavenly army wherein she is told he has been enrolled. The way in which she obtains the picture of the Madonna, the petty jealousies of which she is made the victim, the sad fate which befalls her in the very moment of triumph, when the painting is placed on the altar erected at the cost of her savings, are narrated in so lifelike a manner as to impress us with their truth.

*The Wyntertons of Netherwood* is thoroughly English. A fair young girl in the springtide of her happiness, is asked to blight the whole of her future by giving her hand to a man she detests, in order to screen her father from the shame and dishonour attendant on the exposure of a crime committed by her brother, and of which the man she is required to marry alone possesses the knowledge. The scene in which she consents to the sacrifice of her life, and the closing scene wherein that sacrifice is consummated in a most unexpected manner, are full of pathos and beauty. The third tale opens with a startling incident; a mysterious apparition and an apparent crime which proves to be a forecast of the future. The hidden purpose, long unrevealed, which the terrible scene enacted by the shadowy personages was to serve, is made plain when the narrator meets with one of them again in an Australian hospital, and is the means of reconciling him to God by the knowledge, so singularly obtained, that he displays of the past life of one who is seemingly a stranger to him.

The last story is historical, for it records the history of some of the Catholics who were ejected from house and home during the persecution under Queen Elizabeth, and also the



sufferings endured by the inhabitants of London at the period of the Great Plague. But these matters are subservient to the narrative itself. It is one of Christian forgiveness and heroic charity, of the triumph of grace over nature, the conquest of that desire for vengeance that lurks in every human heart, and when once kindled, is so difficult to subdue. The fate of the apostate, riding jubilant and triumphant to take possession of the lordly hall which is the reward of his iniquity, is a powerful piece of writing; we cannot refrain from giving a few sentences from it.

Featherstone, on the brink of the declivity, lost his foothold and fell, rolling over and over in his headlong course, bruising himself severely, yet all the while retaining sufficient presence of mind to endeavour to arrest his fatal progress. He caught at the bushes on the bank, they stayed for a moment, but could not prevent, his fall; he clutched at the branch of a tree, but it swayed and snapt, incapable of sustaining his weight. Ere long he lay at the bottom of the precipice, battered and bleeding, half stunned by his fall, but still fully conscious that death was staring him in the face. Aloud he cried for help, but the noise of the water seemed to drown his frantic cries; only the echoes of the rocks took them up, and repeated them afar, as if to deride his agony. How terrible were the thoughts which at that moment crowded, fast and fearful, into the mind of the wretched man! As often happens in the case of dying persons, there passed before his mental vision, in swift and awful review, the whole of his past life. Had he not apostatized from the faith, had he not persecuted the Church of Christ, had he not denounced the servants of Christ? He knew that the very torrent, which in the course of a few brief seconds must inevitably swallow him up, was the self-same stream by the side of which the martyred priest had fallen, and that the water, which had never been able to wash out the stain of his victim's blood, would soon hurry him to his doom. (p. 181.)

No attempt to point a lesson is made in these pages, but high principles and lofty motives are indirectly inculcated as the rule of our conduct. Their influence on the reader cannot fail to be a greater appreciation of faithful unswerving obedience to the law of God, steadfast loyalty to the Church, and unselfish charity to our neighbour.

## *Literary Record.*

---

### I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

ST. PIUS V., the last of the canonized Popes, lived in stormy days, when dangers of every kind encompassed the Church of God. Between Turks and Protestants, it seemed as if the Bark of Peter was about to be shipwrecked and to disappear amid the hostile influences around. But God raised up as its pilot the holy Dominican, to whose prayers the victory of Lepanto was mainly due, and whose self-denying zeal and piety and sufferings and supernatural wisdom saved a great portion of Europe from the ravages of the heretics. In Father Wilberforce's brief summary of the personal history of the holy Pontiff,<sup>1</sup> and of the chief events of his Pontificate, there is gathered a large amount of information in pleasant and attractive form.

Blessed Edmund Campion has been accused of having given under torture, in the year 1581, information respecting certain Catholics that led to their arrest and condemnation. This accusation Father Forbes shows in a pamphlet,<sup>2</sup> which is a reproduction of an article written by him in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, to be a cruel calumny, and quotes among other proofs of his innocence, of the charge, the words of Cecil, that "it was easier to rack the man's heart out of his body, than a word out of his mouth." We hope that this good work of vindicating the blessed martyr may be carried on by the skilful pen of Father Forbes in the shape of a complete Life, which may supersede the somewhat unsatisfactory Life by R. Simpson.

The Editor of the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* has complied with the wish expressed at the German Catholic Congress of 1890 that the articles dealing with the Labour question, published in that most valuable periodical, should be reprinted in an

<sup>1</sup> *St. Pius V.* By the Rev. Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. London: Catholic Truth Society.

<sup>2</sup> *Étude sur Edmond Campion, S.J.* Réfutation d'une Calomnie. Par le Rév. P. James Forbes-Leith, S.J. Caen: Imprimerie V<sup>e</sup> Domin, Rue de la Monnaie.

inexpensive form, so as to bring them within the reach of a wider circle of readers. In the pamphlet<sup>1</sup> before us, the fourth that has been issued, Father Lehmkuhl answers the assertion, made by Herr von Puttkamer, in connection with the socialistic riots in Belgium, that the Catholic Church is impotent in face of the social difficulties of the day. In the first part, he shows that the social uprisings are not the work of "true sons of the Church," but of those who disobey her commands and neglect her teaching. In the second, he discusses the question of wages, and points out that the material misery of the working classes is to a great extent due to practical disregard of Christian principles on the part of employer and employed. In the third he advocates the observance of Sunday as a means of obtaining the Divine blessing on the other days of the week, and in the fourth he speaks of the work of St. Peter Claver among the negroes as an example of what true religion can do to elevate the lower orders. The name of the author is sufficient guarantee that the subject is treated in a masterly and yet simple manner.

It is pleasing to find a foreigner taking so much interest in our system of education as to make the careful and extensive research into its past development and present status which is necessary for the compilation of the monograph<sup>2</sup> before us. From the period immediately preceding the Reformation, Father Zimmermann traces down to the present time the history of the public and principal grammar schools of England through all the vicissitudes, religious and political, through which the country has passed. The result of the suppression of monastic schools by Henry VIII.; the scanty endowment of educational institutions in the reign of Edward VI.; the changes made under Mary and Elizabeth; the detrimental influence on learning exercised by the State clergy; the intellectual stagnation of the past century, and the new life of the present century, are portrayed with the skill and accuracy of one who has thoroughly investigated the subject in hand. Besides this, the men most distinguished as schoolmasters, the new methods they introduced, the curriculum of studies, the system of examinations, of rewards and punishments, the games and exercises, the customs and traditions peculiar to the various schools, are

<sup>1</sup> *Die Sociale Frage*. 4te Heft: Die sociale Noth und der Kirchliche Einfluss. Von Aug. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *England's "Oeffentliche Schulen"* von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Von Athanasius Zimmermann, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlags-handlung.

duly discussed in the pages of a pamphlet for which every one interested in education will heartily thank the painstaking author.

The zealous Vicar General of the diocese of Nottingham has just brought out the *Garden of the Soul* combined with the authorized *Manual of Prayers*.<sup>1</sup> Up to this time the *Garden of the Soul* in its old form clashed with the new and approved version of prayers; while the *Manual* did not give a number of devotions, instructions, preparation for the sacraments to be found in the venerable prayer-book of our grandparents. The union of the two produces a complete, handy book of practical Catholic piety. There is room for improvement in the type and paper of the book, but we imagine that this is to be accounted for by the laudable desire of the publishers to make it as cheap as possible.

Two other numbers of Miss Dobrée's *Stories on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* have appeared, one of them under the title *In Duty Bound*, the other with the somewhat quaint heading of *F Flat and F Sharp*.<sup>2</sup> The former illustrates the happy effects of the gift of piety and loyalty to God's Church in a simple, honest, Catholic girl. The latter shows how God gives the gift of understanding to those who in all humility seek to do His will, while He withholds it from the self-satisfied who pride themselves on their talents and intellectual power. These stories have a happy simplicity that makes them most suitable for the young.

*A Practical Guide for Catholics*<sup>3</sup> is a capital little book, containing advice and instruction on several necessary matters of Catholic life in the simplest language. Sick Calls, Marriage, Mixed Marriages, Baptism, Spiritual Reading, Societies, are some of the subjects explained. The chapter on Mixed Marriages deals prudently with a very delicate theme.

Every one feels an interest in Dismas, the Good Thief, who obtained on the cross the signal grace, not only of conversion, but of an immediate entrance into Paradise. A little book,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Garden of the Soul combined with the Manual of Prayers*. Edited by Mgr. McKenna, V.G. Dublin: Duffy and Co., 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *A Seven-fold Treasure*. Stories on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. By Louisa Emily Dobrée. No. 2. *F Flat and F Sharp* (Understanding). No. 6. *In Duty Bound* (Piety). London: Catholic Truth Society.

<sup>3</sup> *A Practical Guide for Catholics*. By a Missionary Priest of the Diocese of St. John, Mo. Second Edition. St. Louis: Herder, 1892.

<sup>4</sup> *Dismas, the Good Thief*. From the French of Father Cros, S.J.

which gives all the information that can be had respecting him, will be acceptable to all who hope that they may, like him, obtain the grace of a good death. We recommend it to our readers, and as there is no publisher's name on the cover, it may be well to state that the translator is the Rev. E. J. Schmitt, Weltes, Ind. U.S.A.

The St. Anselm's Society gives us a Second Edition of *Philotheus and Eugenia*,<sup>1</sup> written by the late Serjeant Bellasis and first published in 1861. It is described in the secondary title as a series of dialogues between two Anglicans on Anglican Difficulties, the dialogues being real and founded on memoranda of certain conversations held between the writer and his wife whilst they were finding their way towards the Church. Although written so long ago, it is as suitable for the present as for the past generation, and will be found very serviceable. "The Rosary, and doing acts with an Intention," "Latin Prayers," "Abandonment of our Reasoning Powers," "Reading the Bible," "the Jesuits," are the titles of some of the fourteen conversations, and give a good idea of the ground covered. As conversations they are decidedly good and have the air of reality, and as explanations they enter very thoroughly into the Catholic case, and put it forcibly. There was no great necessity for the author to plead by way of apology that "if Philotheus had been a Catholic, his explanations would, no doubt, have been more complete."

*The Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1893*<sup>2</sup> is an American Catholic Annual. Its special feature is the series of short biographies, illustrated by some good portraits, mostly photographic, of the American Catholic celebrities who died in 1892, as also of one or two saintly persons. The get-up is excellent, but regarding it from an English point of view we should have liked to have some ampler statistics of the great American Church.

*Spiritual Crumbs for hungry little Souls* is a little book of instructions,<sup>3</sup> partly on ordinary virtues, partly on Scripture stories for young children. It will be of assistance to Catholic mothers

<sup>1</sup> *Philotheus and Eugenia*: Dialogues between two Anglicans on Anglican Difficulties. By Mr. Serjeant Bellasis. Second Edition. London: St. Anselm's Society, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *The Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1893*. New York: Catholic Publication Society. London: Burns and Oates, Limited.

<sup>3</sup> *Spiritual Crumbs for hungry little Souls*. By Mary E. Richardson. New York: Benziger, 1893.

who require a few hints how to talk to their children on such subjects.

As far back as 1872 Bishop Zwerger wrote a little book<sup>1</sup> for the instruction of his flock which was received with much favour and has run through several editions. Miss Vavasour now translates it under the supervision of Dr. Schobel, of Oscott. Regarding life as a Pilgrimage, it treats first of the Ways to Eternity, Right and Wrong, then of the Guides, True and False, and last of the Ends, Good and Bad. The plan is thus seen to be on the lines of a retreat, and much of the book is of the character of retreat instructions. Other parts, however, aim more at instruction than meditation, as those which speak of Liberalism, Old Catholicism, &c. The translator has done her part well. German is a hard language to translate from, and yet her English flows smoothly and clearly.

Five stories, translated from the German of Canon Schmid,<sup>2</sup> whose name is familiar to us as the writer of entertaining tales for children, form an attractive volume, well suited for a gift-book or prize. They are mostly tales of many years ago, and many a legend, half-historical, half-fanciful, is woven by the author into the narrative. We read of lofty castles and bands of robbers; of gentle ladies driven from lordly halls and forced to take refuge in humble cottages; of children torn from their homes and restored after long years by the good providence of God to their sorrowing parents: these and other romantic incidents of a similar character give the book a singular charm for the youthful mind. The moral of these tales is excellent; the peasantry are simple, industrious God-fearing; the nobles are pious and liberal to the poor; virtue sooner or later invariably meets with its reward, while vice and injustice, though they succeed for a time, ultimately receive condign punishment.

Miss Nichols, with whose artistic skill we are already acquainted through her charming *Lines of Thought*, and still more charming *Thoughts in Lines*, has shown the versatility of her talents by a contribution to histrionic art.<sup>3</sup> The motive of

<sup>1</sup> *The Pilgrim on the Way to Eternity*. By Dr. Zwerger, Prince-Bishop of Seckan. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by Ellen Vavasour. London: Washbourne.

<sup>2</sup> *The Black Lady*, and other Tales. By Canon Schmid. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company.

<sup>3</sup> *Zoroaster*. A Dramatic Fragment. By Catherine Maude Nichols. Norwich: Agas H. Goose, 1892.



*Zoroaster*, which is a dramatic fragment rather than a drama, is taken from the well-known work of the name by Mr. Marion Crawford. Miss Nichols has selected a portion of the Eastern story and woven it into a whole. The love of King Darius for a fair Jewish Princess, who is attached to his Magian, Zoroaster ; the estrangement between the two latter personages caused by the jealousy of Darius's Queen ; the noble conduct of the hero, who prefers to absent himself from the Court rather than interfere with what he considers to be a real affection of his betrothed for his royal master, form the subject of the various scenes of this little play, which ends with an invasion of barbarians, who massacre all present.

*Poems in Petroleum*<sup>1</sup> is a suitable name for the clever but rather eccentric volume lately published by Mr. John Cameron Grant. Some of them we do not hesitate to describe as exceedingly beautiful, and breathing the true poetic spirit. Others are rather painfully realistic, and sometimes introduce modern ideas and conceptions that seem to us out of place in poetry. For instance, we find it hard to either understand or admire the lines—

Here Involution strong as Life  
Makes Evolution strong as Death,  
Reversion straining in the strife  
Perversion foils with poisoned breath. (p. 121.)

But, on the other hand, there is a most touching sweetness in the little poem that begins with the lines—

Sadness and Gladness, Sweet,  
Are near allied ;—  
Joy stood trembling at the feet  
Of the Crucified.

Grace grew out of loss,  
Happiness from pain,  
Agony upon the Cross  
Blossomed into gain (p. 110),

and in many other of the minor pieces.

<sup>1</sup> *Poems in Petroleum*. By John Cameron Grant. Second Edition. London : E. W. Allen.

## II.—MAGAZINES.

The Goethe-cultus has reached such a pitch of late, and has led to so many attacks, direct or indirect, against religion, that Father Baumgartner has thought it expedient to publish a biography of the great German poet written from the Catholic standpoint. A poet himself and a true appreciator of genius, he has performed his task ably. The view he takes of Goethe, who admired the externals of Catholicism, though a pagan in his beliefs, and whilst extolling the Christian religion, sapped its foundations, is given in the *Études* for December. The opening paper, on the Catholic movement in Germany, contains an account of the Conference held in Mayence last August. The politico-religious situation of Catholics in that country is not yet wholly one of peace, but rather of progress towards peace, *aditus ad pacem*, as the Holy Father expressed it. The beneficial result of associations for different classes of the people, and the hold the priest obtains by their means over his flock, is especially emphasized, as well as the influence of the Conference on ecclesiastical art. In a second article on the fertility of Palestine as compared with Egypt, Father Delattre points out that the chief difference consists in the fact that the soil of the former country yielded abundant produce at the cost of slight labour, whereas that of Egypt, though extremely productive, required for its cultivation extensive hydraulic works, which necessitated the intervention of a wealthy proprietor on whom the peasantry were dependent. There is no doubt that in the period of its prosperity Palestine was above all lands "flowing with milk and honey" in a literal, not merely figurative sense. The principles of transformism have in some past numbers of the *Études* been subjected to careful and thorough scrutiny. The topic is again brought before the reader, to show how unscientific and impossible is the system that would evolve organic life and powers of the intellectual and moral order from a blind cause. The concluding notice of the life and labours of Mgr. Freppel considers his social influence. His view of the labour question is summarized in the following formula: liberty of the individual, liberty of combination for legitimate ends, State interference only to protect rights and abolish abuses. In the course of "A Walk in Cairo," Father Baudot's agreeable

pen traces a description of the funeral *cortège* of an Egyptian princess, which the levelling hand of progress has not stripped of its picturesque national peculiarities.

Under the title of "Ancient proofs of the existence of God and modern science," Father Granderath, in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* for January, refutes the recent assertion of a Protestant theologian that human reason, unaided by revealed truth, cannot come to the knowledge of God. His arguments in this first instalment are drawn from natural science. In the following paper Father Pesch traces the gradual steps whereby, under the influence of leading agitators, the socialistic movement in Germany has within the last forty years become a power which threatens to overthrow social order. The chapter of Pascal's biography contains the history of the dispute as to the nature and work of grace between Port Royal and the Jesuits, which led to the publication of the famous *Lettres Provinciales*. Aluminium, a rarity some forty years ago, is now one of the commonest metals. The process whereby it is obtained, and the place it holds in combination with certain chemicals in the household of nature, forms the subject of a first article in the *Stimmen*. In a future one we shall learn its chief use in the service of man. The story of Mirabeau's early life, which forms a fit prelude to the part he played in the Revolution, is set before the reader by Father Pfälf. From the early literature of India, into which he has given us an insight, Father Baumgartner passes on to that of China, which is little known in Europe. As is the case with all Oriental nations, the earliest writings of this singular people consist of sacred books, wherein the fundamentals of their religion, their intellectual and social life, their history and traditions, are embodied in the form of long poems.

In the opening number of the *Katholik* for 1893, a biography is commenced of the late Abbot Wolter, who for a considerable period ruled the famous Benedictine Abbey of Beuron. His Order owes a great deal to this able man, and he rendered besides great service to the Church in Germany. In an interesting paper entitled, "The Representations of St. Anne in their relation to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception," Dr. Schmitz points out that art, as the handmaid of religion, always bore testimony to that dogma, and impressed it on the minds of the people, by directing their devotion in a special and distinct manner to the mother of Mary. The tendency of

the present day is to make human learning the criterion of the Church's history in regard to the development of doctrine, thus exalting the results of modern historical research above the infallible authority of the divinely appointed teacher. In order to determine in what manner the history of the Church should rightly be studied, the *Katholik* proposes to examine in the first place the essential nature of the Church, the immutability of her constitutions, her teaching and her discipline. A biographical notice is also made of a theological writer and preacher, a zealous defender of the faith at the time of the Reformation, by name Peter Sylvius. When troubled with doubt, he received at the shrine of Loreto a miraculous enlightenment, enabling him to discern the true doctrine from the Lutheran errors.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* (1021) gives the text of the Holy Father's Brief to the Bishops of Italy, and also that which he addressed in the vernacular to the Italian people, warning them to be on their guard against the machinations of the Freemasons, who endeavour to instil their poison everywhere, seeking to undermine society and destroy Christianity. These are followed by some comments on the utterances in reference to them of the Grand Master at a recent banquet held in Naples. The letter of Signor Bonghi, whose candidature for a seat in the Chambers was rejected by three electoral colleges, in consequence of his hostile attitude to the clergy, published in the *Nuova Antologia* in defence of his principles and assertion of his wrongs, is discussed in the *Civiltà*. His profession of faith is shown to be faulty in regard to the Divinity of Christ, the Divine authority of the Church, and the temporal power of the Papacy, besides other points. In another article the policy of the Holy Father in relation to Russia, condemned in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review*, is defended and justified.

